DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 068 041 HE 003 484

TITLE	Organization, Function and Results of Social Self-Management at the Institutions of Higher Education and Their Associations. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Yugoslav Inst. for Educational Research, Belgrade.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-A-1-1969
PUB DATE	Jun 72
GRANT	OEG-9-001000-827
NOTE	181p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; *Educational Administration; *Governance; *Higher Education; Professors; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Yugoslavia

ABSTRACT

Presented in this document are the results of a study conducted in Yugoslavia designed to investigate: (1) problems of structure, organization, development and function of self-managing organs at faculties and universities; (2) problems of university and faculty self-managing organs' relations, as well as association of faculties as self-managing organizations; and (3) problems of relations between university and faculty and authority organs and decentralized management. Results of the study indicate that self-management in institutions of higher education in Yugoslavia has been accepted and is generally succeeding. However, because of a lack of experience in coordination of rights and duties of self-management participants, some difficulty is being experienced. (Author/HS)

ED 068041

NCERT

BR A1-1969

Final Report

Project No. A - 1 - 1969
Contract No. OEG-9-001000-827

Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research
Draže Pavlovića No 15
11000 Belgrade, Yugoslavia

ORGANIZATION, FUNCTION AND RESULTS OF SOCIAL SELF-MANAGEMENT AT THE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND THEIR ASSOCIATIONS

June, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Research and Development

HE003484

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 068041

F i n a l R e p o r t

Project No A - 1 - 1969
Contract No OEG-9-001000-827

Organization, Function and Results of Social Self-Management at the Institutions of Higher Education and Their Associations

Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research
Belgrade - Yugoslavia

20 - VI - 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Author's Abstract	I - III

Chapter I: INTRODUCTION

1. Socio-economic and political changes causing introduction of self-management into Yugoslav universities	1
2. A short history of self-management in Yugoslav higher education	5
3. Research theoretical foundations	8
4. Survey of similar researches	10
5. Definition of problems	12

Chapter II: METHODS AND PROCEDURES

1.General View on Methods and Procedures Applied in this Research	14
2. Definition of Criteria for Sample Determination	15
3. Procedures and Methods Applied in this Research	19
4. Forms of Exterior Collaboration	24
5. Phases of Work	25

Chapter III: RESULTS

1. Bases of contemporary conception of Self-Management	29
2. Survey on the Structure and Organization of Self-Management Bodies at Universities	34
3. Financial bases of Self-Management on Faculties	59
4. Forms of Associations of Faculties	68

Chapter IV: DISCUSSION

	Page
1. Relation between Government organs and Higher Education Institutions	74
2. Mutual relations of Self-managing Organs of Higher Education Institutions and their Communities / University/	81
3. Relations between Higher Education Institutions and Society; Position of Students-Participants in Self-Management	86
4. Forms of Self-Management	98
5. Work content of Self-Managing Organs; Methods of their Decision-Making; Position and the Way of Engagement of some Participants	106
Chapter V: CONCLUSIONS	119
- Supplementary and Appendix Materials	128
A. Bibliography	A
B. Glossary of Terms	B
C. Appendixes	

A B S T R A C T

The research work: "Organization, function and results of University self-management" has been planned in the form of three years investigation (1969-1972) aiming to study the following basic groups of problems:

1. Problems of structure, organization, development and function of self-managing organs at faculties and universities;

2. Problems of university and faculty self-managing organs' relations, as well as association of faculties as self-managing organizations;

3. Problems of relations between university and faculty from one hand, and authority organs and decentralized management on the other hand;

This final report on the research results has 5 parts.

In the first part (the introduction) socio-economic and political changes causing social management and self-management at the higher education have been analysed; a short survey of self-management at the Yugoslav universities has been presented; the theoretical foundations of the research have been given, as well as survey of the similar research works; the problem, aim and subject of research have been defined.

In the second part (Methods and procedures) the plan of the research has been shown, sample choice and analysis method have been explained.

The method of investigation of opinions and attitudes of about 2,000 teachers, students and administrative staff on the sample of 12 faculties has been presented.

In the third part (results) the structure and degree of self-managing organs development have been analysed (types, organization, structure and scope); financial resources of the existing self-management structure have been discussed; The new way of free faculty and community uniting has been analysed. The basic characteristics of a complete self-management conception have been presented.

In the fourth part some basic research results in the area of self-managing organs between the university and faculties have been in more details analysed; the relations of the university self-managing organs and authority organs, as well as relations between the university self-managing organs and society as a whole, have also been analysed. At the end of this part functioning of self-managing organs through the content of their work, as well as the method of preparation, passing and carrying out their decisions have been shown. In this connection special characteristics of some self-management, participants categories' position has been mentioned (teachers, students, assistants).

On the basis of data given in the third and fourth part some conclusions and statements in the fifth part have been presented (conclusions). This part deals with matters which have, or have not been achieved in the up-to - the present work and some problems and possibilities of the further development have been indicated.

On the basis of this research the following could be stated:

- in Yugoslavia, the whole conception of the self-management at higher education has been made;

- more or less definite structure of self-managing organs at all faculties and universities has been established; their relations (rights or obligations) have been established as well;

- relations between the university and faculty organs and the authority organs have been replaced by the new relations between authority organs and the university;

- former budget-administration relations have been replaced by financing by corresponding funds as well as by communities of interests;

- the status of some categories of persons working at higher education institutions has been improved and the number of their representatives in some cases has been increased.

As the general conclusion in the Report it has been stated that self-management at the higher education institutions in principle has been accepted, and in general it has been realized, although there are some laggings behind in regard of new human relations' development which it requires (because there is not experience enough in coordination of rights and duties of self-management participants).

Enclosed to the Report are the original instruments used in the research, the tables of investigations, explanations of terms (glossary).

III

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

1. Socio-economic and political changes causing introduction of self-management into Yugoslav universities

Introduction of social management[x], and later on, self-management[x], into Yugoslav higher education was necessary consequence of the chosen development of Yugoslav society after the World War II. First of all, it was necessary to destroy barriers of economic and cultural backwardness. It is quite understandable if we know that in 1945 the industrial workers were making only 5,8% of the total number of employed people, and the percentage of illiterates over 10 years of age was 25,4% (in 1948). Number of the elementary schools in 1945, comparing with 1939, was increased; but about 10.300 of teachers were lacking; during the war the number of secondary schools was reduced for more than 100, and number of pupils for about 100.000. The absolute growth was seen only in higher education. The number of higher schools was increased in 1945/46 to 33, comparing with 26 in 1938/39, and number of students from 16.978 increased to 25.339.[1]

By the Second Yugoslav Constitution of 1963 (the first one was passed in 1945), the proclamation of establishment of workers self-management[x] from 1950 was affirmed and the further development of the whole society on the self-management basis was projected. In June of 1954 the Federal National Assembly

---

1) Yugoslavia 1945-1964: Statistical Review, Yugoslav Institute for Statistics (Statistički pregled, Savezni zavod za statistiku), Belgrade, Nov.1965.

x) Terms marked by this sign will be explained in the Glossary.

passed the University General Law by which the social management at universities and faculties was inaugurated. The Article No.2 of this Law reads as follows: "Universities and faculties are independent institutions based on the Social management principles."

Establishment of the social management at universities and in the whole educational field meant the beginning of deetatisation process in the domain of social work and social functions and, in that way rendering the gradual connection between education and other fields of social work as well as establishing in them the inner integration based on the new principles of socio-pedagogical organization.

Differently from enterprises institutions in the field of education have been proclaimed for the institution of the special social importance and following such treatment the influence of citizens and their associations in the system of school management had to be provided for.

Later, on the basis of the Constitution from 1963, the establishment of self-management in higher education institutions aimed at their equalization with industry workorganizations with regard to the essential rights for work, earning and distribution of income. In the higher education institution councils the social community representatives, have still been kept in, having their rights ingerentions in the fields which are of general social interest.

The increase of work production and national income, caused by the constant increase of employed workers and white collars in the period 1945-1967 (which has been renarcable)[2)]

---

2) Pečujlić, M: Future which has begun (Budućnost koja je počela), Borba, Reflector, Beograd, 29,30.VI, 1969.

as well as growth of integrational processes in industry, required uniting of industry and education and in this way simultaneously they have caused and made feasible the self-management development at the university.

The important cause for establishing social management and later on, self-management into the field of education, immediately after the establishing workers' self-management, lay in the need for finding out not only professional cadre necessary for development of people's welfare, but as well cadres of a new social kind, the cadre who, taking part in self-management, learnt how to realize and develop the already set up processes of transformation in socio-economic relationships and applied this knowledge when they began to take part in the active social life of the country.

Democratization of relations within the university was also caused be so called explosion in education. The explosion took place in Yugoslavia, too, as a part of the whole world process and simultaneously, as the result of socio-political changes in Yugoslavia, which was trying to make the expansion feasible. In the period of 1945 to 1960 the number of higher schools was increased in Yugoslavia from 33 to 204, and the number of students was more than fivefold. Some universities, with greatly increased number of departments, were not able to exist as centralized organisms. The expansion could be traced by the following table:

Development of Schooling in Yugoslavia 1938/39 - 1960/61 [3]

	1938/39	1945/46	1950/51	1960/61
Elementary Schools				
Number of schools	9 190	10 666	13 878	14 527
Number of pupils	1 470 973	1 441 679	1 930 621	1 764 369
Number of teachers	34 663	24 303	32 114	84 279
Secondary Schools				
Number of schools	1 070	959	1 786	1 471
Number of pupils	210 530	113 677	314 772	353 423
Number of teachers	13 374	14 549	28 320	24 556
Higher Schools				
Number of schools	26	33	84	204
Number of students	16 978	25 339	59 822	140 574
Number of teachers and collaborators	1 204	1 248	4 562	10 355

In such socio-historical, economic and political conditions the democratic conscience of teaching staff and youth at the university has gradually intensified and with it the need for establishing more democratic relations and forms of attitude in mutual communication and management at the university.

Beside the general political and socio-economic conception which was the main reason for establishing into the Yugoslav higher education, firstly, social management and then, self-management, there were other reasons, which were linked with the main one, accelerating it or showing it down, the reasons deriving from the world's general conditions or

3) Yugoslavia 1945-1964 Ed.Statistical Review (Statistički Pregled), Belgrade, November, 1965.

specially Yugoslav historical, social, political and cultural conditions and changes.

2. A short history of self-management in Yugoslav higher education

After the World War Second, in the development of management and self-management system at the Yugoslav universities three main phases can be seen:

The first phase 1945 - 1954 was characterized by administrative management. It was the period of work reestablishment at higher school, of solving the main financial and staff problems. Financing and making decisions on the main questions concerning work and development of the universities and faculties were in the competence of the minister of education. Teaching staff had a status of civil servants; their problems were regulated by Law on civil servants. Recruitment of teaching staff was carried out on the basis of competition which was made public by the Ministry of Education, and nomination was done by minister of education on the basis of the professional qualification obtained from the corresponding Faculty Council. The Dean was elected among the university professors by the Faculty Council, and the choice was approved by the minister of education. Chancellor ((Rector)) was elected among the university professors by the University Assembly, but the choice was to be confirmed by the President of Republic Government. At the end of this period management democratization has already begun and it was directed:

a. towards separating university autonomy from the state administration;

b. towards democratization of relations between faculties and the university;

c. towards "opening" of the university to the public and to broader influence of the society.

The important characteristics of social management at hither education institutions, inaugurated by the University General Law (1954), was the new structure of management organs. In university and facultycouncils not only teaching staff, but representatives of students and other employed cadre, as well as certain number of representatives of public, cultural and scientific and industrial workers, that is, people outside the faculty, were elected. In the same way in relationships and distribution of responsibilities among managing organs the standard type of hierarchy was abolished - each of those organs stands on its rights and its duties within the law and statute competences. It means that councils, representing the social organs of management, having in them persons working out of the university and faculties are not counteracted by councils consisting mainly of teaching staff.

Social management at institutions of higher education was in 1964 displaced by self-management. It was done after the new Constitution was passed (in 1963), by it self-management was inaugarated in all types of working organizations and institutions, including institutions in the field of science and education. This act marked the beginning of the third phase of the post-war management development at higher schools, the phase which is still in the process.

System of self-management organs and their competences are harmonized with Constitution principles and regulations in the Basic law on institutions` managing organs, as well as with the General law on workers'councils and other managing organs` elections. Up-to-then structure of faculty councils has been changed in favour of teachers and other staff, who being employed as exercise on the basis of the Constitution

all the self-managing rights. As the new Constitution contains the regulation reading that "schools are institutions of the special social importance", and that in the self-management of these institutions "the interested citizens and representatives of organizationa and social communities take part", this has been kept, no more, as an obligation but as a possibility. In revized republic laws on higher education and in statutes of higher education institutions good use of this possibility has been made, so that newly elected faculty councils and councils of other higher schools(in their extented structure) have mainly kept, beside students representatives, the representatives of community, as well. The number of representatives of each category, as well as the kind of case they take part in, have been precised by the statute.

By the mentioned constitution changes the university has been given the status of the association of autonomous higher education institution, and not the status of the autonomous work organization. . University self-managing organs consist of the representatives of associated faculties and other higher schools, Competences of these organs are also determined by the will and interests of associated higher schools.

Republic assemblies, as the highest self-managing organs have kept their power in decision making in the field of educational objectives, school system uniformity, establishment of higher education institutions and their development planning, and in the financing - establishment of resources and principles of their distribution. Higher education institutions` financing doesn`t come any more out of the Republican budget but out of Republican education communities. These communities are also self-managing associations composed of interested institutions and organizations. Representatives of the university and higher education institutions are supposed to take part in the work of their councils and executive organs.

3. Research theoretical foundations

Management in education and in the field of higher education, too, comprises authority and responsibility system as well as the system of relations between education and the society authority representatives. At the same time, management in education comprises relations and communications which are formed in the education institutions among those who are educated and between them and other interested factors.

Social management "means the system which is based on the direct and indirect citizens participation in execution of and in managing other community affairs." Applied to the field of education it means that in education management representatives of interested school and out-of-school factors take in it their part.

Self-management in education means such a type of management in which, on the essential components of education system, as well as on concrete affairs and plans of educational institutions, those who perform education directly and together, make decisions, that is, those for whose sake the education has been carried out, as well as "carriers" of the broader human and social interest responsible for the success of the activity.

These terms and conceptions are going to be used in this Report in the following meaning.

In the present developed societies' function of education tends to get more and more independent. That is, education becomes more and more the essential factor of socio-economical process. Therefore, even in the centralized social systems, if their productive power and general culture are developed, we can find the process of decentralization and more democratic principles in management in education, this

trend is so strong today, that it should be taken into account as one of the main agitating component of society and education development.

In the recent history of education and in the history of higher education, too, we can distinguish, at least, two basic types of management: authoritative and democratic type of management. Education system, its objectives, contents, methods and basic relations in the authoritative type of management are determined and strictly controlled by the central social authority. In the democratic type of management of this field the right and participation of all, or of majority directly interested, are respected and esteemed. In this type of management one can still find the remains of hierarchy, both in general competence of the institutions and in their socio-pedagogical relations. But the main characteristics of this type is the remarcable tendency to get all relations democratized.

The new type of Yugoslav management has not been realized to such extend as to be characteristic for the whole education system. It has not been worked out in details, yet. Socio-economic prerequisites for its theoretical basis and practical evaluation have been in the process of creation, now in Yugoslavia, although the system has been both nominally inaugurated and introduced. It is considered that for such a type of management the following should be characteristical:

a. that participants in education activity, possessors of resources, those responsible for success and development of social interests should take direct and indirect part in decision making on the basic problems of the educational system, its objectives, its contents, its particular parts and concrete forms, as well as on their development;

b. that the basic relations in this field are characterized by the solid co-operative interaction of various collaborators, who are directly and indirectly interested in, and

that hierarchical relations between them have been changed by authonomy and integration of those interested and of participants.

In spite of the very complicated phenomenon whose basic components have been under the influence of great number of factors, we can't talk about harmonious development of university self-management in Yugoslavia. During the development of Yugoslav society and its universities various and numerous needs have appeared but financial means and other opportunities have always been insufficient to fulfill them.

The country development requires the university to adjust itself faster to the needs of industry and even culture, but in the most cases the university is not able to answer these requirements. From one hand because the society has not enough means to fulfill the constantly growing needs and expenses of higher education, and on the other hand, the university itself suffers from some weaknesses. The traditional structure of the university which originates in the class and patriarchal society resists to the age of industrial development and democracy - this is only one of the negative characteristics of present conditions.

4. Survey of similar researches

Development of self-management is not an autonomous, isolated process, but in fact a complex "historical process in which the workman and the creator-man are gradually going to subordinate to themselves all modern systems of management."[4)]

---

4) Kardelj,E.: On War, Piece, Leninizm and Self-management (o Ratu, Miru, Lenjinizmu i Samoupravljanju) An Interview to the journal: "Die Neue Gesellschaft", Beograd, Reflektor, 10-I-1970.

For the self-management development in higher education it is very important to follow-up this process, to work it out in its theory in details, and to help it develop. That`s why during the whole last decade in Yugoslavia its great number of problems have been under constant consideration of the university, scientists and experts, of socio-political organizations, students and citizens, and were the subject of many scientific and public discussions, and for some of them researches have been undertaken.

291 bibliographical notes from this field have been written during the period of 1954-1970/71. Analysis of these data shows that the number of articles and discussions on self-management development at the university has doubled after 1964, when social management was changed by self-management. In the period from 1954-1964, 97 bibliographical notes appeared and during the next seven years (1964-1970) the number of them was more than doubled. The beginning of this period was characterized by popularization and comments of the new laws, especially laws on higher education financing. In 1968 contemplations and treatises on the essential problems of self-management system organization and functioning, problems of the position and relations among participants in self-management, as well as actual problems of university role in industrial and social development of the country have prevailed. All these problems were in connection with the demand for the thorough higher education reform.

Still, the problems of students` position and participation in self-management, as well as discussions on introducing economic relations between society and university (the price of education) were most often discussed in articles and treatises.

Since 1967 the first, preliminary research works on self-management development at Yugoslav universities have begun. In 1967 the following appeared: Analysis of organization and

functioning of self-management at higher education institutions in Zagreb, Questionnaire in the journal "Gledišta" on social relations at the university, Contribution to finding out element for realization of the new financing system at the university. To the modest number of research works, in this period, two questionnaires and the definition of theoretical problems on students` participation in self-management have done in the Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research -could be added. There were similar kinds of work done by the Institute of social sciences in Belgrade and the University Institute in Zagreb (1968). The traditional international scientific conference "University today" always held in Dubrovnik, as well as other actions and meetings of university assemblies have given their share to efforts in order to include not only considerations but also deeper research of the problems of self-management development at the university.

In such conditions and circumstances the research under the title: Organization, functioning and results of decentralized administration and self-management at higher education institutions and their communities - couldn`t be conceptualized in another way then as the preliminary establishment of the conditions and of basic theoretical and practical problems in this field.

5. Definition of problems

From the wide scope of problems appearing in the practice and which are comprised in the broad theme of research work, the following three groups of problems have been taken out to be investigated and observed in more details:

1. Problems of structure, organization and functioning of self-management(organs` structure and degree of development, distribution of authority and interrelations, effectiveness).

2. Problems of interrelations of self-managing organs at the university and faculties and democratization of relations within the university (position, rights and obligations of some categories, of directly and indirectly interested factors and their interrelations).

3. Problems of university and faculty relations at one hand, and public authority organs and decentralized administration at the other hand.

Beside the short history on self-management development at the university in Yugoslavia, beside analysis of socio-economic and political changes which have caused introduction of social management and self-management, which make the necessary part of the research, the actual parts of the research work include the following:

-1) The analysis of structure and degree of self-management at higher education (types, organization, structure and scope of self-managing organs on the basis of normative regulations documents, financial basis of existing self-management structure).

-2) Analysis of relation between self-managing organs at the university and faculty and authority and administration organs.

-3) Analysis of interrelations between self-managing organs at the university and faculty and the new way of uniting faculties on the basis of their mutual interests.

-4) Analysis of functioning of self-managing organs (their preparation and making decisions; self-managing organs' actual content of work and the character of their decision).

-5) Evaluation of conditions and proposals for self-management improvement -- opinions, attitudes, and proposals of the university staff, students and socio-political organizations concerning improvement of the existing self-management system.

Chapter II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

1. General View on Methods and Procedures Applied in this Research

The system of self-management in higher education has been built up during a 17 years period, different forms of it have been shaped, important experiences have been obtained and concrete results have been achieved. But in the course of all these years no systematic research on this institution has been done, except some summaries regarding condition of self-management in the scope of general surveys on higher education problems.

Therefore it was both necessary and justifiable to organize a systematic research on self-management in higher education whose aim would be to follow up existing condition, level of development, achieved results and perspectives for future development of this institution.

In order to show the structure and conditions of self-management at the moment of investigation, it was necessary to perform field investigation, to make a cross section of a particular situation, by using mainly descriptive research methods, procedures and techniques.

Aiming to make such a cross section of the situation, in which the structure and functioning of the mechanism and financial conditions in which self-management takes place would be presented, mainly statistical research methods have been applied and along with them various types of other methods: analytical and historical, by using different research instruments, such as questionnaires, interviews etc.

As a cross section was not always sufficient to give a complete survey of the existing condition, it was necessary to make also a longitudinal section for some questions, and to make a deeper investigation of particular questions. In this case research of individual cases had to be done by using more precise techniques in order to find out causes of the existing situation (i.e. regarding organization, functioning of self-management at some faculties).

The research was meant to have mainly a character of a combination of a transversal survey (a section got as a result of investigation of situation in a set period) and a longitudinal follow up.

Investigation of the level of self-management development, its functioning and existing forms has been done on a faculty sample, mainly using a method of inquiry.

The sample of higher schools has been made by random sampling method, and stratification has been done proportionally in republics.

Field investigations have been carried out by the following methods: 1. by inquiry; 2. by analysis (study of documents of self-management bodies, normative documents, statutes); 3. by interview (discussion with a number of members of Faculty Councils and Faculty Teachers' Board); 4. by direct observation method, in following up work of self-management bodies on a number of faculties from the sample.

A certain number of questionnaires has been required for the inquiry and they were used to get the necessary data during the investigation.

2. Definition of Criteria for Sample Determination

In defining criteria for determination of sample of higher schools in which research would be performed, it was

necessary to start from the following basic data:

1. The aim of research is as follows:

"... to organize .... a scientific research on self-management in higher education in order to find out existing condition, problems, level of development, achieved results and perspectives for its future development ...."

"In this respect, the general aim of research lies in investigating the character of social self-management in the system of higher education, the structure and functioning of the self-management mechanism ...., the ways and forms of its realization, as well as up-to-date experiences and results leading to the independence of these institutions of higher education."

2. In the Research Proposal it has been planned "to perform investigation regarding the level of development of self-management, its functioning and forms on a sample of faculties and higher schools...."
"The sample of higher schools would be made by random sampling method, and stratification would be done proportionally in republics...."

3. In the Statistical Bulletin, issued by the Federal Institute for Research in Statistics, in No.574 of June 1969[5], in the part entitled "Higher Schools in 1967/68", it is stated that in this academic year there were

a) Faculties	99[6]
b) Art Academies	13

.....

5) Last Bulletin in which identification of each institution of higher education separately has been possible.

6) Two more faculties have been added to the number of 97, as were evidented in this Bulletin: 1) Faculty of Political Sciences in Belgrade, founded in 1969 from the Higher School of Political Sciences and 2) Faculty of Physical Education, founded in 1969 from the Higher School of Physical Education.

c) Higher Schools of University Rank[7] 12

T o t a l : 124

d) Higher Schools 138

Total Number of Institutions of Higher Education: 262

The aim of research and basic variables contained in its context as well as the planned type of sample in the Research Proposal seemed quite harmonious, logical and rather clear. But when sample had to be determined, some problems and difficulties appeared: 1) Should the sample be made out of all institutions of higher education including higher schools (total of 262), or only out of faculties and higher schools of university rank and art academies (total of 124), or just out of faculties (99)? 2) What percentage of the whole number of these institutions should be included into the sample in order to make it representative? In solving these problems the Project Group tried to find out such solutions which would be in accordance with the mentioned methodological demands and at the same time most suitable for realization.

It has been decided to make the sample out of faculties and higher schools of university rank and art academies.

Higher schools were not included into the sample for in systems of education in foreign countries such schools, even if they exist, are not part of institutions of higher education. But various types of higher schools of university rank and art academies are equal to universities regarding

7) Therefore the number of 14 Higher Schools of university rank has been lessened to 12.

duration of studies, as well as some other important characteristics.

As for the scope of sample, it has been decided that a sample including 10% of the whole number (124) of institutions of higher education would do, having in mind the general aim of research and the variables, and especially the fact that each of these institutions has a large number of students who could take part as subjects in the investigation. On the basis of data on condition, level of development, achieved results and perspectives for future development of self-management in 12 or 13 institutions, a complete survey of self-management in institutions of higher education could be got under condition that sampling was done by random sampling method from the complete list of faculties, art academies and higher schools of university rank.

The following institutions have been included into the sample following the mentioned procedure:

1. Faculty of Biochemistry - Ljubljana
2. Faculty of Electrical Engineering - Zagreb
3. Faculty of Philosophy - Belgrade
4. Faculty of Philosophy - Sarajevo
5. Faculty of Philosophy - Zadar
6. Faculty of Mechanical Engineering - Kragujevac
7. Faculty of Medicine - Belgrade
8. Faculty of Metallurgy - Skoplje
9. Faculty of Metallurgy - Zenica

10. Faculty of Law - Split
11. Faculty of Forestry Engineering - Belgrade
12. Higher School of Industrial Pedagogy - Rijeka

3. Procedures and Methods Applied in this Research

a) Way of Inquiry Organization

Collection of opinions, attitudes and proposals of participants in self-management regarding up-to-date results and perspectives of future development of self-management at 12 faculties has been carried out in November and December 1970.

Investigation has been done by method of inquiry of teaching staff, assisting teaching staff, technical and other staff and students.

Since there were several cathegories of participants which differed in number, the investigation has been organized in the following way in order to get equivalent groups:

- all teachers and other assistants in teaching who were at work at the time of investigation have been included into the inquiry (only those being on sick-leave, on a journey or absent for some other reason have been excluded from the inquiry);
- 50% from the cathegory of "technical staff" have been included into the inquiry. This cathegory comprises: librarians, administrative, technical and assisting personnel. Selection in this cathegory was usually done by choosing every second person from the list of employee. Inquiry of employed personnel has been usually done at work, in cabinets, laboratories, in the administrative building, in the teachers` room, etc.;
- in the case of students 12% of the whole number have been included into the inquiry. The choice has been done by method of random sampling, either by selection of a set number

of students from each year of studies from the list of enrolled students, or by selection from the lists of students enrolled in particular groups or sections. In case there has not been possible to make either a proportional sample or a selection of an equal number of students according to the year of study and group of study, a set number of students from each year of study has been selected out of three most numerous study groups and they have been inquired after lectures.

Necessary questionnaires have been made for inquiry of participants: a) a questionnaire entitled "General Data on Faculty" , which helped to get some important data on the characteristics of a particular faculty, which make it different from other institutions included into this inquiry; b) a questionnaire for the Dean`s Office of the Faculty from the sample (questionnaire No.II); c) a questionnaire for the sample taken from the population of all participants in self-management (questionnaire No.I).

The inquiry content referred to the organization, functioning, failures and achieved results of self-managements at selected faculties, as well as to proposals on the way how to overcome the failures.

From the participants in all three mentioned cathegories about 2000 filled-in questionnaires have been gathered; about 1100 have been filled-in by students, about 600 by teachers and about 300 by technical personnel.

A more detailed survey of the sample of investigated groups at faculties in the academic year 1970/71 is presented in the following table:

Cathegory: 1.Teaching Staff	Total	Cathegory: 2.Students	Total	Cathegory: 3.Technical personnel	Total
Professors and Associate profs.	155	Students of I & II year	339	Librarians & admin.p.	119
Assistant profs. and Lecturers	172	Students of III year	433	Technical personnel	65
Assistants to Teachers	240	Students of IV & V year	308	Assistant personnel	41
Associates in Teaching	94	Unknown year of study	4	Unknown kind of work	4
T O T A L:	661		1084		229

Total number of participants : 1974

The results obtained by means of this questionnaire have been processed in 29 tables enclosed in this Report.

Questionnaire No.II has been sent to the Dean`s Offices of faculties from the sample and was meant to help in getting opinions on functioning of self-management bodies, on position and participation rate of particular cathegories of participants and ways of decision making. Answers from 11 faculties have been obtained.

b) Organization of Interviews with Members of Self-management Bodies

In further investigation of problems of self-management on the chosen faculty sample, it has been planned to perform research on the functioning of self-management bodies of the faculty and methods of their decision making.

In order to achieve this aim, it has been necessary to answer the following questions: what is the content of work of self-management bodies really like in practice, how are they working and which methods and patterns are they using in their work, what categories of participants are taking part in this work and to what extent, and what are up-to-date effects of self-management.

The only way to get answers to the above mentioned questions, besides investigation on data gathered by help of questionnaire and the corresponding documentation, was the organization of interviews with members of various self-management bodies. In this respect at three faculties from the sample[8] the following members of self-management bodies have been interviewed:

- 3-4 members of Faculty Councils
- 3-4 members of Faculty Teachers' Board
- The Dean or his assistant
- The Secretary of the Faculty
- 3-4 members of the Faculty Board of the Students'Union
- Some members of the Committee of the Year
- Some members of the Commission.

On the whole this interview has been aimed to find out how the theoretically based system (model) of self-management at faculties, set by regulations, really "behaves in practice",

---

8) Biotechnical Faculty in Ljubljana, Faculty of Metallurgy in Zenica, and The Higher School for Industrial Pedagogy in Rijeka.

whether and if so to what extent does it diverge from the previously planned and set-up conception, and which problems appear thereabout; to what extent is this system (model) really efficient and what are the achieved results regarding the improvement of work and development.

Interviews have been performed on the basis of instruction in which the following basic questions included in research have been considered: 1. content of work of self-management bodies; 2. methods of decision making of self-management bodies; 3. character and level of participation of particular cathegories of participants; 4. position of students in the self-management decision making; 5. effectiveness and up-to-date results of work of the self-management bodies, etc.

x

x x

Besides gathering data and investigation, by means of inquiry and interviews, regarding opinions of self-management participants on achieved results of self-management at faculties, it was also necessary to consider opinions of some outstanding scientists and social and political workers, who gave these opinions in the course of discussions on reform of university.

So the survey on views and opinions regarding self-management in higher education has been completed by the presentation of views and opinions of some eminent and competent persons.

Naturally, since time and means were limited, only the opinions of experts who treated the mentioned problems in the most complex way have been used in this research.

c) Analysis of Documents, Regulations, Statutes, etc.

In the first phase of this research collection of documentation has been done, as well as preparation of bibliography of books and articles on self-management, analysis of collected documentation, statutes of faculties from the sample and legislation on higher education from republics. A comparative analysis of other normative acts of the faculties from the sample has also been performed.

4. Forms of Exterior Collaboration

In the course of the whole research work the main problem has arised in engaging collaborators from outside for the realization of project. A particular difficulty lied in the fact that prominent experts from the faculties have been very much occupied by the work on university reform and it was very difficult to engage them in this research.

As has been set in the Research Proposal, the Research Personnel consisted of: director of the project, and collaborators from the Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research (3 research scientists and a documentalist) and research affiliates and consultants from other institutions. University professors from Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana have been research affiliates as follows: in the course of the first and the second year of research Dr Bogomir Sajovic, Professor at the Faculty of Law in Ljubljana; Dr Ante Vukasović, Assistant Professor at the Education Department of the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb and Dr Dimitrije Đorđejev, Assistant Professor at the Sociology Department of the Faculty of Philosophy on Zagreb. Only during the second year of research Dr Vera Pilić, Professor at the Faculty of Economics in Belgrade, and during the third year Dr Mihajlo Ogrizović, University Professor from Zagreb.

Besides the above mentioned research personnel, 4-5 researchers for field investigations and a statistician for gathering and processing of data have also been engaged in this research.

Collaborators from outside have been engaged mainly as consultants in making instruments for field investigations and other methodological materials, as authors of some parts of research treating particular problems and as reviewers of those chapters done by the collaborators from the Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research.

5. Phases of Work

The investigation regarding the organization, functioning and results of self-management has been organized and realized in the course of three years, i.e. in three phases starting on July 1, 1969 and ending with June 29, 1972.

In the first phase of work 1969/70 the theoretical bases of self-management in higher education have been carried out as well as the historical development of self-management starting with an idea and finished by an realized institution. The following problems have been particularly considered:

- socio-economic and political changes which caused the introduction of social management and self-management in higher education;
- historical survey of the social management development;
- modern conception of social self-management resulting from the latest acts of legislation;
- opinions, attitudes and proposals of direct participants in self-management regarding up-to-date results and possibilities for further self-management development.

In the second phase the following problems have been studied: structure and organization of the system (mechanism) of self-management at universities.

The following questions have particularly been studied:

- organization, structure and competence of self-management bodies at universities and faculties;

- forms of self-management, level of development and suitability;

- interrelations of self-management bodies at universities and faculties and government authorities and administration;

- interrelations of self-management bodies at universities and faculties.

In the third phase the functioning of self-management at faculties has been studied and results obtained in the previous two years of investigation have been analysed, and then this final study has been done.

Chapter III

RESULTS

The results presented in this chapter have been achieved by studying corresponding literature, and particularly literature on previous similar investigations, by analysis of documentation, statistical data, legislative acts of governmental bodies, autonomous acts of faculties and universities (statutes and the like); there are also results achieved by questionning direct participants in self-management at 12 faculties (included into the sample) and by interviewing a number of members of self-management faculty bodies (also at faculties included into the sample). A number of opinions and attitudes of experts, stated in the course of discussions on university reform or quoted in important documents of various forums, have been used as supplements and correctives.

The performed investigations have shown the following:

1) On the basis of principles proclaimed by the Constitution of 1963, amendments to the Constitution, the Federal Law on Education, republican laws on higher education, autonomous regulations of universities, as well as numerous theoretical assumptions of forums and experts - a well-developed conception of self-management relations at the university has been generated and it is progressively developing into a form of complete, modern conception of self-management; self-management at the university has gained its legal basis not only in general terms, as a system, but the competence of self-management bodies has been set by regulations; this is one of the most important assumptions of self-management, since self-management itself is based on the principle of

strictly set rights (and duties) of all its bodies as well as of each participant as an individual;

2) The self-management development on the above mentioned basis has lead to a specific structure of self-management bodies at faculties and universities; in some cases this structure has been fully developed, while in other cases only partially and after overcoming some difficulties and dilemmas;

3) The whole system of self-management relations is set on a financial basis having the following main characteristics: a) material-financial business set on the principle of income[x]; b) changes in the character of investment in higher education (transfer from the sphere of consumption into the sphere of production); c) attempts towards an augmentation of self-management participants' influence in obtaining, planning and spending financial resources; d) changes of main financiers (from governmental bodies to the communities of interest[x] and financing from funds);

4) The new position of faculties as independent self-management organizations has enabled them to associate and unite in a new way - without intervention of governmental bodies, as a specific form of superstructure of self-management on faculties.

In further exposition each of the above mentioned results will be interpreted separately.

---

x) Terms marked by this sign will be explained in the Glossary.

1. BASES OF CONTEMPORARY CONCEPTION OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

The system of self-management at universities has been set on a more or less institutional basis. Efforts have been made in order to compose the self-management bodies so that representatives of all interested social factors would be present, including students as the main beneficiaries of the higher education institutions.

In developing the mechanism of self-management in higher education, the legislator started from shaping self-management institutions, setting their competence and their interrelations. In the course of the legislative development of these institutions the constitution of right to decision making of particular categories of participants has been made, and in various stages of self-management development the scope of their rights in the self-management sphere has been changed (sometimes augmented and sometimes lessened).

Therefore the problem of management on faculties cannot be separated from the institutional structure of the self-management system and the position of particular bodies, their composition and their competence in that system of self-management.

The system of self-management is legally regulated by the following: the Constitution, the General Law on Education[x)] republican laws on higher education[x)], statutes of universities and faculties and general regulations on the organization and management of institutions and work organizations.

---

x) Terms marked by this sign will be explained in the Glossary.

According to these regulations, the faculties are self-management work organizations inside which there exist the self-management bodies (the faculty council, the faculty board, the managing board, the faculty teachers' board, etc.). Outside the faculty there are university bodies (the university council, the university assembly, the Rector) which are not superposed to the faculties, but they have mainly a role of coordinators[8].

Besides faculties and universities there exists the Union of Yugoslav Universities as a specific form of association, as well as some other forms of association of higher education institutions.

In all kinds of social activities in Yugoslavia (economy, education, culture, health etc.) there exist such forms of public affairs management which are aimed to enable an active participation of citizens. Now directly interested people (producers and others) make their decision about problems which were before under the competence of governmental bodies[9]. For example, schools are now managed by teachers, students, pupils and other citizens. The same situation is in various scientific, cultural, health and other institutions.

---

8) Other bodies and factors aimed to help the higher education development influence this system, too. Their role consists in making conditions and normative solutions necessary for satisfactory solving of problems regarding higher education. They will be explained in Chapter IV, in the part entitles "On Interrelations of Governmental Bodies and Institutions of Higher Education".

9) This process of business and competence transferring from governmental bodies to self-management bodies in society is called deetatization.

Those who are managing these organizations (members, workers and other interested representatives from society) have the right to make decisions regarding organizational problems, work and business of the particular organization. This independance in decision making is not complete. Namely, in their decision making the self-management bodies have to follow regulations set by governmental bodies. But in the scope of those regulations the bearers of the management right, or the bodies which perform the management in their name, have full right to make decisions.

Previously schools have been managed by governmental bodies, and now by self-management bodies composed of teachers, colaborators`representatives, pupils` representatives (in higher education), as well as of representatives of other interested organizations. It can be stated that now the organization of management is based on the principle of self-management of interested members of society. Therefore such a form of management of social affairs is considered as a f o r m o f s o c i a l s e l f - m a n a g e m e n t. In that way it is stressed that society, i.e. interested members of society have the right and possibility to manage directly particular social affairs, and not only through governmental bodies.

In the Federal Constitutional Law of 1953 it has already been stated that self-management of working people is guaranteed in education, culture and public welfare, as well as that this self-management is carried out through self-management institutions.

The passing of the Amendment No.XV to the Federal Constitution, in 1968, has been of great importance for the development of self-management in higher education institutions and its equalization with the position of work organizations in direct production.

Upon putting the mentioned Amendment into effect, it is not possible any more, as it has been according to previous legislative practice, to constitute by law management bodies (except councils), their structure, competence, time and way of their election and release. The Amendment has made it possible for these problems to be regulated by statutes of work organizations, i.e. by statutes of higher education institutions.

The establishment of the kind and competence of the faculty self-management bodies is thus transferred from the republican legislation into the sphere of statutary autonomy of the faculty and the university. So further development in this direction depends upon the statutes of faculties and universities, and their changes are just in progress.

In the Federal Constitution Amendment No.XV of 1968, this kind of autonomy is stated as follows:

" In the realization of self-management, working people in a work organization as a whole and organizations of associated labor* (working units) state those problems which they are to solve directly and commit certain functions of management to the Workers` Council, or, in accordance to the kind of the work organization`s activity, to some other management body, and some executive functions to some collegiate and independant bodies responsible to those bodies and elected by the Workers` Council.

Working people in a work organization determine the management bodies of that work organization and its organizations of associated labor, state their competence and the period to which these bodies are elected and conditions and the way of their election or release.

A particular procedure and way of election and release of an independant executive body of a work organization carrying out activities of special social interest, can be stated by law."

A work organization is founded as an enterprise, or as an institution, as an institute or as some other kind of organization in the field of public services.[10] Thus work organizations exist primarily in the field of economy, and also in other fields of social activities, comprising the field of higher education.

The self-management autonomy in work organizations in economy has always the characteristics of the field of their activity. But the situation of self-management and autonomy in work organizations in higher education is quite different. Namely, the recognition of their work and their activities is not depending upon the market, but upon a most adequate satisfaction of society's needs for highly qualified experts. Therefore the autonomy in these work organizations is always connected to the cooperation of representatives of adequate communities of interest. Such work organizations belong to the organizations performing activities of special social interest.

---

10) In the Constitution of 1963 activities like education, culture, health etc., are referred to as public services. Work organizations in the field of higher education represent a very important field of public services. They are the highest educational and scientific institutions, i.e. work organizations, and the socio-economic, scientific and cultural development of the country is highly dependent upon them.

2. SURVEY ON THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF SELF-MANAGEMENT BODIES AT UNIVERSITIES

I

The self-management relations at universities have been based on regulations of the Federal Law on Education and republican laws on higher education. Contrary to previous federal laws on universities and faculties (passed in 1954 and 1960), the new Federal Law on Education from 1964 (in accordance with the Constitution) does not regulate directly the management, i.e. self-management at universities and faculties, but leaves it to republican laws and university and faculty statutes.

Finally, the Amendment No.XV to the Federal Constitution (from 1968) and amendments to republican constitutions and republican laws on higher education changed in accordance with these amendments (in the period of 1969-1970) definitely leave to the faculties to regulate self-management in their statutes, in accordance with the principles of self-management in work organizations, set in the constitution.

Since the realization of this process has just been started (i.e. the Amendment No.VII to the Constitution of SR Serbia and the Republican Law on Higher Education of SR Serbia changed in accordance with this Amendment) it is understandable that this material is not yet included into the new statutes of faculties. In the meantime the situation is different in republics. Therefore, first the structure of the bodies on the basis of republican legislation (valid towards the end of 1970) will be presented and then a survey of the latest changes in their structure will be given.

By analysis of republican laws on higher education[11] the existance of the following management bodies has been stated:

A. Bodies in Institutions of Higher Education and their Structure

1. The C o u n c i l - exists according to all republican laws.

2. The Faculty Teachers` Board exists also according to all republican laws, but according to the Laws of Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia (in this republic called the Pedagogic-scientific Board)[12] and Macedonia it is put into the category of management bodies, and according to the laws of Bosnia and Herzegovina and of Montenegro into the category of the so-called professional bodies.

3. The Faculty Board exists according to all republican laws on higher education except in the law of SR Serbia.

---

11)-Law on Higher Education of the Socialist Republic of Serbia (Službeni glasnik SRS, Nos.32/65, 53/66, 32/68, 41/68. -Law on Higher Education of the Socialist Republic of Croatia (Narodne novine, Nos.52/65 and 41/66). -Law on Higher Education in the Socialist Republic of Slovenia (Uredni list SR Slovenije,No.9/69). -Law on Higher Education in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia (Službeni vesnik SRM, Nos.15/65 and 29/65). -Law on Higher Education in the Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina (Službene novine SR BiH ,No.23/65). -Law on Higher Education in the Socialist Republic of Montenegro (Službeni glasnik SR Crne Gore, Nos.5/67 and 7/67). -General Law on Education (1964) - renewed. - Constitution Amendment No.XV SFRJ (Službeni list SFRJ, No.55/68).

12) The Pedagogic-scientific Board is a self-management and professional body in the field of education and scientific work.

4. The Faculty Assembly exists according to all laws except in the law of SR Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in the law of Montenegro it is put into the category of the so-called professional bodies.

5. The Committee of the Year is not particularly mentioned in the laws of Croatia and Macedonia, and it exists in the laws of the remaining four republics, either in the category of the management bodies (Serbia, Slovenia), or as a professional body (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro).

According to republican laws on higher education, the structure of higher education institutions' bodies is as follows:

In the Faculty Councils in all republics there are three categories of membership: a) members elected by the working community of the institution; b) members elected by the students; c) members who are representatives of certain socio-political communities, and d) the Dean of the Faculty. This would be a kind of the obligatory minimum of the Council membership. Besides these members, according to the Law on Higher Education of SR Slovenia and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina, a set number of members is delegated by the Republican Assembly; according to the Law of SR Macedonia and of SR Montenegro these members are nominated by the Executive Council (the Republican Government). There exist also members who can be appointed by the Council of the city in which the faculty is situated (the Law of SR Macedonia and of SR Bosnia and Herzegovina). Finally, there are members nominated by the founder (enterprise, a university, etc.) if the faculty has not been founded by law.

The Faculty Teachers' Board has a more or less same structure according to all laws: all teachers and all co-workers (Serbia), or only colaborators' representatives

(Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina) and representatives of students. There is a slight difference regarding representatives of students: according to the SR Serbia and SR Slovenia (the Pedagogical-scientific Board) students are represented in a formally-legal way, since in SR Croatia and SR Macedonia there exists only a regulation stating that students may participate in the work of the Board through their representatives. According to the laws of SR Bosnia and Herzegovina and SR Montenegro, the participation of students is not planned at all in the Teachers' Board.

The position of the Dean is similar at all faculties and there exists a difference only in the way of his election.

The Faculty Board is anticipated by the laws of Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Montenegro and it is not anticipated by the law of Serbia. The Faculty Council appoints the Faculty Board from its members (in Croatia "from the members of the work organization and students"). The Dean is always its member by function. The number of the Faculty Board members is 5-7 (i.e. it is stated in the law that it should be at least 5 members, or the law leaves to the statute to state the exact number).

The Faculty Assembly is anticipated by all republican laws, except in SR Bosnia and Herzegovina. In some of the laws the Assembly acts as a management body (in Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia), while in other laws it is treated as a professional body (i.e. in Montenegro). The Assembly consists of teachers and other working people and students or their representatives (in Serbia); of teachers, colaborators and students (in Croatia); teachers, research workers, colaborators and students (in Slovenia); members of the working community[x)] (in Macedonia), teachers and other working people,

colaborators, students or their representatives (in Montenegro).

The Assembly of the year is anticipated by the laws of SR Serbia, SR Slovenia and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina. The membership of the Committee is always similar; all teachers and colaborators and students or their representatives, according to a set rule.

B. University Bodies and their Structure

1. The University Council exists in all republics except in Montenegro where there does not exist a University.[13)]

2. The Rector is anticipated by all republican laws, except in Montenegro where there is no university.

3. The University Pedagogical-scientific Board exists only according to the new law of SR Slovenia (1969).

4. The University Assembly is stated by the laws of SR Serbia and SR Slovenia and only presumed according to the law of SR Croatia.

The University Council. In all the republican laws on higher education (except in Montenegro) the following categories of membership are anticipated: 1) Members appointed by the Republican Executive Council (the republican government) or the Assembly (in Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina). 2) Representatives of faculties

13) According to the statutary decision of January 11,1971 it has been replaced at the Belgrade University by an Assembly.

appointed by these institutions (at least one representative). 3) Representatives of students (at least one in SR Slovenia, maximum six in SR Bosnia and Herzegovina). 4) Rector and pro-rector. 5) A representative appointed by the Assembly of the city in which the university is located, from the Assembly members (only in SR Serbia, SR Croatia, and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina). 6) Members delegated by interested associations (in SR Croatia, SR Slovenia, and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina). 7) A representative of the Secretariate of the University (in SR Serbia and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina).

The Pedagogical-scientific Board of the University anticipated by the law of SR Slovenia consists of: the Rector and the Pro-rector, all Deans, a member appointed by each of the Pedagogical-scientific Board of the Faculty and two student representatives.

The University Assembly is particularly stated in the laws of SR Serbia and SR Slovenia, and it is not mentioned in the laws of SR Croatia, SR Macedonia and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Assembly consists of: representatives of teachers and co-workers of higher education institutions, representatives of students, of working units of the University (in SR Serbia), of all members of the Pedagogical-scientific Boards of the faculties (in SR Slovenia). In SR Croatia this body is not particularly stated, but it is mentioned in the description of the election of the Rector.

There is no University Assembly in Montenegro.

II

On the basis of the comparative analysis of laws and the statutes of 12 faculties included into the sample, the following general principles of self-management organization at faculties can be draws as being common:

1. In principle the higher education institution is managed by members of the working community of the faculty, in a direct and an indirect way.

The members of the working community manage in a direct way: a) at the working people meeting, b) by referendum, and c) through initiatives and by submitting their propositions to the self-management bodies.

They manage in a direct way through the self-management bodies.

2. Students participate in the management of institutions of higher education. The following is stated thereabout in the General Law on Education (art.14): "Pupils of higher grades and s t u d e n t s take part in the management of schools in accordance with the law".

3. The so-called social representatives delegated by the Community Assemblies or by i n t e r e s t e d[14] enterprises and other organizations in society[15] take part in the management of affairs of particular social interest.

---

14) Namely, the enterprises from the field of activity for which the cadres are prepared at the faculty.

15) " In accordance with the law interested citizens and representatives of interested organizations and the social community take part in the management of particular affairs in the schools" (art.2, page II of the General Law on Education).

4. All the self-management bodies at higher education institutions are of the same level regardless to the fact that they consist only of the members of the working community or not. This means that there are no superior and inferior bodies.

5. Besides self-management bodies in a narrower sense (the Council, the Managing Board, the Dean) there are also the so-called professional bodies) the Teachers` Board, the Assembly, the Committee of the Year, or the Section or the Stream) which are not self-management bodies in the proper sense, but they have some rights in self-management. As a consequence, there are two lines of decision making, one being the decision making of the educational-scientific collective (the Teachers` Board), and the other the decision making of the bodies of the whole working community (the Council, the Managing Board).

Direct Self-management

This form of self-management is realised through referendums and assemblies of students, teachers and other working people on the faculty (there exist assemblies comprising only those included into a particular year of study or assemblies comprising all staff and students on the faculty), and also through yearly assemblies of the faculty.

Direct self-management is mentioned in statutes of all faculties. But it does not prove that this form of self-management is really highly developped on faculties, since only its initial forms (initiatives) are mentioned, and assemblies are held very seldom. Regarding direct self-management,

the situation at 12 faculties included into the sample is as follows:

- on 3 faculties all the three existing forms of direct management are present (working people`s assembly, referendum, initiative);

- on 8 faculties there exist two forms of direct management: referendum and working people`s assembly;

- on one faculty there is only working people`s assembly.

The working people`s assembly is one of the forms of direct decision-making of the working community`s member on higher education institutions. The assembly consists of all members of the working community, regardless to the fact whether they have a full-time job, a half-time or less than a half-time job.

The working people`s assembly discusses some problems which are important for the work of a higher education institution and makes decisions thereupon, and deals particularly with the following:

- states the list of candidat s for election of the members of the Council who are appointed by the working community,

- discusses the statutes propositions, regulations regarding income distribution, regulations regarding work relations and the like.

The management bodies are obliged to act in accordance with the decisions of the assembly.

At the assembly working people have an opportunity to make decisions, in a direct way, on numerous problems being of vital interest for each member of the work organization. ... But there exist some difficulties in the work of the assembly. Namely, it is very difficult to gather together all the working people from the institution, and even if they can be gathered, there are some difficulties resulting from the work of such a numerous and heterogeneous assembly. It is impossible for all participants to take part in discussions in such numerous assemblies, and there is also the problem of competency, i.e. whether everyone should deal with all problems, even those specific and regarding scientific work and teaching staff.

The referendum is also a form of direct decision - making of working people on faculties. It is used particularly when deciding upon problems regarding the statute of the faculty, separation of a working unit into an independent institution, its association to another institution, integration of institutions etc. The referendum is convoked by the Council in its broader composition. Members of the working community make their decision upon a set problem on a referendum by vote. The management bodies are obliged to carry out the decisions from the referendum.

The referendum has its advantages and its disadvantages. The advantages are in its democracy and freedom of decision-making. The method of secret vote used at referendums enables working people to make decisions and give their opinions on certain propositions in a direct way and in accordance with their attitudes.

But there are also disadvantages of such a way of decision-making. One of them is in a rather complex procedure which demands considerable preparations, great expendi-

ture of labor and time on its organization, and all that prevents a more frequent use of referendum. Another disadvantage is in the fact that particular problems cannot be discussed, participants cannot explain their attitudes, but they can only vote "for" and "against" set propositions. Therefore, prior to a referendum usually assemblies of working people are convoked, and problems are discussed and propositions upon which working people will decide on a referendum are defined.

Indirect Self-management

The structure of bodies existing on the faculties included into the sample is as follows:

- on 8 faculties the complete structure of self-management bodies (the Faculty Council, the Faculty Board, the Faculty Teachers' Board, the Dean) are fixed by the statute;

- on 4 faculties there is no Faculty Board;

- on 4 faculties there exist the Faculty Council, the Faculty Board, the Faculty Assembly and the Dean;

- on 9 faculties there is a Committee of the Year (of section or group);

- on one faculty there is a Pedagogic-scientific Board;

- on 10 faculties the Faculty Teachers' Board and the Pedagogic-scientific Board are included into the basic structure of bodies - besides the Faculty Council, the Faculty Board and the Dean, while on 2 faculties they are put into a separate category of the so-called professional bodies - together with the Committee of the Year and in some cases with the Faculty Assembly.

T h e F a c u l t y A s s e m b l y according to the statutes of 7 faculties acts as a regular management body besides the Faculty Council, the Faculty Board and the Dean, and only exceptionally it is put into the category of bodies which, according to the statute "have particular functions in self-management". In the statutes of 4 faculties the Faculty Assembly is not particularly mentioned. On 3 faculties it consists of all members of the working community and a certain number of student representatives; on 3 faculties it consists of all teachers, co-workers and students; on 2 faculties of all teachers, co-workers and a set number (up to 30) student representatives. On some faculties the Faculty Assembly does not exist, and its functions are performed by the Working People's Assembly.

T h e F a c u l t y C o u n c i l on all 12 faculties consists of a category of members elected by the working community (the so-called Council in its narrower session) and members elected by the Republican Executive Council or the Republican Assembly (the Republican Executive Council elects members of the Councils on 8 faculties and the Republican Assembly on 4 faculties). There are also members appointed by interested social and other work organizations.

The greatest number of the Council members are those elected by the working community (from 14 to 26).

In the Councils of all faculties there are 2-8 members elected from and by the students.

The total number of the members of the Council is 22-37.

T h e F a c u l t y B o a r d is usually appointed by the Faculty Council and consists of members of the working community. It has 5-7 members. The Dean is usually the member of the Faculty Board, by function.

On 4 faculties 1 or 2 members of the Board are students. On the other 4 faculties having the Faculty Board there are no students - members of this Board.

T h e F a c u l t y T e a c h e r s` B o a r d consists usually of all teachers and a number of co-workers (usually 1 representative to every 5 co-workers).

On 7 faculties student representatives can take part in the work of the Board, but they have no right to make decisions. Exceptionally on 1 faculty they have also the right of decision-making.

T h e D e a n and his Deputy are present on all faculties. At most faculties the Dean is elected by the Council, after the proposal made by the Teachers` Board, to the period of 2 years. On 3 faculties the Dean and his Deputy are elected directly by all members of the working community by secret vote.

T h e C o m m i t t e e o f t h e Y e a r does not exist only on 1 faculty. It has the same categories of members on all faculties: teachers and co-workers and student representatives of the said year of study. Exceptionally it consists of representatives of teachers, co-workers and students. Its competency is similar according to the statutes of all faculties.

B o a r d s a n d C o m m i s s i o n s

The Faculty Council, the Faculty Board and the Faculty Teachers` Board are entitled to form common or separate, permanent or temporary boards and commissions aimed to consider and prepare certain solutions to problems from their competency. So there exist Commissions dealing with problems of

teaching, staff problems, scientific-research work, financing, entrance examinations and other examinations, the standard of student living, culture, sports, etc.

The competency of the above mentioned bodies, according to the existing regulations is as follows:

The Faculty Bodies

The F a c u l t y C o u n c i l has the following competencies and duties:

1. formulate the statute of the institution,

2. formulate the plan of work and the program of further development of the institution,

3. formulate the investment plan,

4. discuss on the position and the work of the institution as a whole and undertake the necessary measures,

5. announce, upon proposal of the Faculty Teachers' Board, competitions for the election of teachers and co-workers and confirm their election,

6. nominate the Secretary of the institution and the heads of the working units,,

7. decide upon the disposition of public resources in competence of the institution, all in accordance to the Law,

8. formulate the financial plan and the final account,

9. decide upon foundation of institutions,

10. decide upon introduction of facultative subjects,

11. decide upon the inner organization of work of the institution,

12. formulate the regulations on income distribution, the act on the systematization of jobs and regulations on work relations,

13. decide upon use of means of common consumption,

14. elect the members of the Faculty Board of the institution.

This is general view of the competency of Councils of all categories of higher education institutions. Since the representatives of the social community and of students take also part in the work of the Councils of higher education institutions, the competencies stated in the above mentioned list by Nos.1-9 are also put into the categories of those of the Council in its b r o a d e r s e s s i o n, but those members who are elected by students do not take part in voting on the confirmation of the election of teachers. The competencies stated by Nos.10-14 are those of the Council in its narrower session (consisting only of members elected by the members of the working community), i.e. the members appointed by the social community and students do not take part in decision-making regarding these problems.

The F a c u l t y B o a r d is an executive body of the Faculty Council and has the following competencies and duties:

1. decide upon the work of the institution,

2. take care of realization of the decisions of the Faculty Council as well as of decisions made directly by the working community,

3. take care of the realization of plans and programs of work and development of the institution,

4. decide upon use of public resources which are in the competence of the institution,

5. formulate the Draft of the Faculty Statute and other general acts of the institution,

6. formulate the Draft of the Financial plan, the final account and the plan of investment,

7. formulate the Draft of the program of the institution development and propose the foundation of units of the higher education institution.

The D e a n

1. directly manage the work and represent the institution,

2. take care on the organization of the process of teaching and of adequate realization of the tasks of the institution,

3. take care of the discipline,

4. help to the Chairman of the Council and to the Faculty Board in session preparation and carry out the conclusions and decisions of the Faculty Council, the Faculty Board and the Faculty Teachers`Board,

5. take care of preparation of drafts and other general acts,

6. decide on confirmation about election and release of teachers and co-workers, the secretary and heads of the working units, as well as of other workers in the institution,

7. decide about use of public resources which are in the competence of the institution,

8. give orders for the realization of the financial plan of the institution.

The Dean is independant in his work and personally responsible to the working community and to the management bodies of the institution, and he is also responsible to the social community for the legal work of the institution and for the fulfilment of duties set by law.

The higher education institutions have a Deputy Dean. Larger institutions may have two Deputy Deans.

The Deputy Dean replaces the Dean in case of his absence or in case if something keeps him from performing certain job. The Dean is entitled, to transfer some of his duties to the Deputy Deans, upon confirmation of the Faculty Council in its broader session.

The F a c u l t y T e a c h e r s` B o a r d

1. elect and release teachers and co-workers,
2. formulate syllabi in accordance with curricula,
3. take care about formation of young teachers and scientific workers,
4. discuss problems of teaching and problems which are of interest for teaching.
5. conduct procedure of habilitation, procedure for obtaining the Doctor`s degree and propose conferring of Doctor honoris causa,
6. decide about inviting an eminent scientist or expert to perform teaching,,
7. elect scientific and expert co-workers,
8. consider introduction of post-graduate study and propose programs for that study.

The C o m m i t t e e o f t h e Y e a r

These Committees are similar to the Committees of groups of studies according to their structure and competencies. They consist of teachers and representatives of students of a particular year of study in those groups of studies which are very numerous and it is easier to organize a Committee of

the Year rather than a large Committee of the group of studies. The Committees of the Year meet according to need and consider problems of teaching and studies, propose measures for development of teaching, consider propositions, remarks and applications of students, analyse conditions for instruction, discuss problems regarding excursions, announce and effect competitions for students' work awording.

The Management Bodies of the University

The University Council [16]

1. formulate the University Statute,

2. consider statutes of higher education institutions which are part of the university and give its opinion thereabout,

3. elect scientific co-workers of university scientific institutions,

4. elect the Secretary general of the university,

5. give opinion about introducing post-graduate instruction at university institutions,

6. decide about integration of a higher education institution into the university,

7. formulate the financial plan of the university and the program of further development of the university,

16) In the regulations of the Republican Laws it is stated that it has the right to make decisions on direct competence of faculties. University bodies usually have the right to give their opinions on general acts of the faculties, but the Republican Assembly takes the final decision (for example, the Assembly of the socio-political community confirms the faculty statute).

8. formulate conclusions and recommendations of common interest for faculties,

9. decide about foundation of university institutions,

10. formulate regulations on student welfare,

11. elect and release members of the disciplinary court for students,

12. take care of material situation and other conditions of life and work of students.

The members of the Council elected by students do not take part in the election of co-workers of working units of the university, the election and release of members of the higher and lower disciplinary court for teachers and co-workers.

The R e c t o r

1. represent the University,

2. organize and directly manage the work of the university in accordance with the law and the decisions of the University Council,

3. take care of the realization of decisions of the University Council,

4. promote to the degree of Doctor and Doctor honoris causa, 5. sign diplomas of Doctor degree and diplomas of students who have accomplished university studies,

6. give orders for the realization of the financial plan of the University.

The U n i v e r s i t y A s s e m b l y

1. discuss the Report on the work of the University,

2. discuss matters of general interest for instruction and scientific work and other problems of general interest for the University and give recommendation on those problems,

3. elect and release the Rector and the Pro-rector.

The University Assembly meets according to need, but at least once in two years.

III

As it can be noticed from the scheme of the management bodies of the university, there are two kinds of bodies according to structure: those consisting from teaching and scientific staff and those of all working people of the institution. This is a consequence of tradition and practice of development of the university autonomy and also of a specific character of the university as an institution of particular social interest.

Although self-management exists in a formal-legislative way from 1954 (when the General Law on Universities has been passed), the tradition and practice of self-management exists in higher education institutions from 1950, prior to the beginning of the realization of the process of self-management in enterprises. This fact originates from some particular characteristics of self-management in higher education institutions.

Namely, the Teachers' Boards of higher education institutions have previously also had a relatively important role in decision-making about problems of instruction and scientific work and organization. Such a tendency and practice have made possible that an autonomy of instruction and scientific work at the university develops even prior to the passing of formal-legislative acts on social self-management.

The character of the university as an institution of particular social interest has modified the system of self-management on higher education institutions in relation to self-management in enterprises, and the legislator has introduced also the representatives of the social community, besides the representatives of the working community of the

institution, into their self-management bodies. So at some higher education institutions there exists a difference between the Council in its broader session and in its narrower session and their competencies; this problem will be discussed in the further text.

The process of decision-making of the teaching and scientific staff (the Teachers' Board, the Committee of the Year, the Dean) has already existed, but it has been modified in the course of the development of the self-management rights of the w h o l e working community.

Faculties are the work organizations with the same social position and social relations as enterprises. While previously only a part of the working community (all teachers and co-workers representatives) took part in the faculty management, according to the new regulations of the Constitution from 1963, the working community as a whole has its rights and responsabilities (especially regarding distribution of the whole income and its distribution).

The self-management bodies existing in all working organizations (working people's assembly, the council in its broader and narrower session, the management board and the corresponding commissions) have mainly two kinds or responsibility:

- responsibilities resulting from general regulations and referring to general rights of self-management participants, which are common to all working organizations (particularly referring to material-financial operations, income distribution, organization of work in general and auxiliary services, problems regarding working relations and discipline at work etc.);

-- responsibilities in whose case these bodies only confirm the decisions of the Teachers' Board or discuss on the basis of propositions acquired from the Teachers' Board; responsibilities where the Council of the working community acts only as a confirmative body (f.i. in the case of complaints regarding discipline and the like). This function is usually performed by the Council in its broader session.

The self-management bodies dealing with teaching and scientific work are organized in different ways in different republics and they even have different names.

These bodies are mainly organized as professional bodies in all republics. In SR Croatia and SR Bosnia and Herzegovina they are named the Teachers' Board, in SR Macedonia the Teachers' Council, in Montenegro the Council of the Higher Education Institution, in SR Slovenia the Pedagogic-scientific Council. All the professional bodies have the main characteristic to discuss and decide about problems regarding the organization of instruction and scientific work, to formulate propositions on curricula and syllabi, elect the teachers, co-workers and heads of the teaching units, submit reports and propositions on problems from the competency of the Council, propose candidates for the managing positions etc.

According to the legislative texts of the republics, some duties in the management of higher education institutions are performed by the Committees of the Year. Naturally, their competency is connected mainly to the basic field of activity on higher education institutions -- instruction and its results. This statement is confirmed in the statutes of most of the faculties, where the activity of the Committees of the Year is defined as the discussion and proposition of measures of common interest to the performance of instruction on a particular

year of study. In the formulations dealing with the work of these bodies it is not stated that decisions can be made on their sessions.

Up to now the activity of the Committees of the Year has been shown mainly in the discussion and giving proposals on improvement of instruction organization on a particular year of study, coordination of the scope of instruction, problems regarding attending lectures and exercises, and giving advice regarding regular attending of these lectures and exercises.

IV

After 1968 in SR Slovenia, SR Bosnia and Herzegovina, SR Croatia, SR Serbia and SR Macedonia new republican laws on higher education or final drafts have been passed.

The accepted and proposed laws (and other normative acts) bring biggest changes into management, and therefore they change to a certain degree the above-presented structure of self-management bodies. Therefore it is necessary to give a survey of these latest solutions.

Up to now the final laws have been passed in SR Slovenia, SR Bosnia and Herzegovina and SR Croatia, while in SR Serbia and SR Macedonia only drafts or theses of these laws have been made.

The Law on Higher Education of SR Slovenia anticipates two kinds of management bodies: Councils and Pedagogic-scientific Boards. The composition of these bodies is defined by the Faculty Statute, but it is stated in the Law that representatives of students and of the social community should

be present in the Council. (The Law does not state them as members, but as representatives, but it does not define more precisely the difference in their position). The new Law regulates in a more concrete way the structure of the management of the Ljubljana University. There is also the University Council, the Pedagogic-scientific Board and the Rector. The University Assembly is also anticipated by the Law and it consists of all members of the Pedagogic-scientific Boards of the Faculties which are parts of the University.

According to the Law on Higher Education in SR Bosnia and Herzegovina it is planned that teachers, students, co-workers and other workers state the problems which they solve in a direct way and also state those problems and functions which they commit to the C o u n c i l or a corresponding management body, and some executive functions to the bodies responsible to the Council, which are consisting of more members or it is a function performed by one person. Therefore, the self-management bodies of the institution, their competency, the period of their mandate, the conditions and the way of their election and release are stated in the Statute of the higher education institution. The structure of participants in self-management is also stated by the Statute. According to the mentioned Law the following representatives of society take part in the management of higher education institutions: 1) 4 members appointed by the Republican Assembly of SR Bosnia and Herzegovina, 2) members appointed by the organizations delegated by the Statute.

Students cannot take part in deciding about distribution of income and salaries, and representatives of the social community cannot decide about the organization of work and inter-

relations at work, but only about election of the person performing the direct executive function.

The management bodies of the University, their competency, their mandatory period and the way of their election are stated by the Statute of the University. The Republican Assembly of SR Bosnia and Herzegovina nominates 6 members into the management bodies of the University.

By the new Law on Higher Education of SR Croatia from 1971 it is anticipated that the management bodies on the faculty, their competency, their mandatory period and the way of the election of their members will be stated by the Statute of the higher education institution. Students will take part in the management of the higher education institution, besides the members of the working community, in the way stated by the Statute. According to the Law, one third of the members of the Council and of the body responsible for the organization of instruction have to be students. Students do not take part in decision-making about distribution of income, but they have full right to decide about election of teachers and co-workers.

The way of management of the University is stated by the University Statute.

The Republican Assembly of SR Croatia nominates 5 representatives of the social community who, as members of the University Council, take part in decision-making of all problems except those of income distribution.

The Draft of the Law on Faculties and Universities of SR Serbia is, when compared with the previous regulation, even more general regarding management. It leaves to the autonomous normative acts of the higher education institutions to regulate the said problems in a more detailed way.

3. FINANCIAL BASIS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT ON FACULTIES

As it has already been mentioned, in the period just after the War the autonomy of faculties has been highly respected. Although the state bodies of administration had, in principle, some rights in setting up curricula and other problems about scientific work, there did not occur any difficulties. But all the norms of expense, and especially the decision-making about the most important item of expenditure, the personal incomes, have been in the competence of the management bodies on faculties and universities. It referred primarily to the problem of the number of employees and to their salaries.

The social community has secured large financial and material resources, but their increase has been always insufficient for the constantly increasing needs. This can be illustrated in the best way by few data.

The Expansion of Higher Education in 1952-1968

Indicator	1952	1958	1968
I Material expenses(shown in mil.new dinars)		(Prices in 1968)	
1.Total expenses	57,3	198,6	772,0
2.Material expenses	23,1	65,9	147,0
3.Personal expenses	34,2	132,7	625,0
II Participation of material expenses in total expenses	40,4%	33,2%	19,0%
III Teaching Staff (total)	4.563	7.224	15.950
IV Students (total)	54.763	82.882	210.810

Resources: Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije - 1954,
Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije - 1961,
Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije - 1970.

As it can be noticed from the data presented, the participation of materiel expenses has decreased considerably in spite of all efforts made by the social community, and this fact had not a positive effect to the qualitative improvement of teaching at institutions of higher education.

In such a situation the introduction of the system of income[x)] has started in the sixties.

This introduction has been very slow, and was performed mainly by leaving out the budgetary system and transition into the so-called financing by funds[x)], which has been later replaced by the communities of education[x)]. Naturally, these changes have brought innovations, but they could not bring the needed quality unless the materiel conditions changed considerably; namely, it was necessary to leave completely the administrative way of financing higher education and to introduce completely new socio-economic relations.

x

x x

For an adequate explanation of the material basis of self-management in higher education, it is very important to explain first the character of investment in this kind of education. Then, in dependence of the starting point, new solutions can be sought and they can vary if expenditures on higher education are considered as consumption, or investment.

The attitude that expenditures on higher education are a a kind of social consumption is not yet sufficiently overcome. Although in the course of the latest discussions the attitude that it is the investment into experts appears more frequently, it cannot still be considered the this attitude has prevailed.

A research on the structure of graduates has given the following results:

The Structure of Graduates in Yugoslavia

Disciplines	Number of students			Index of increase (1935-39 = 100)	
	1935-39	1950-54	1965-69	1950-54	1965-69
I Economic	3.018	13.937	35.872	461,7	1.188,6
II Non-economic	8.603	10.151	23.629	117,9	274,6
T o t a l:	11.621	24.088	59.501	207,2	512,0
	Participation in percents (total = 100)				
I Economic	26,0	57,8	60,2		
II Non-economic	74,0	42,2	39,8		

Resources: Statistički godišnjak Kraljevine Jugoslavije 1938-39.
Jugoslavija: Statistički pregled i Statistički godišnjak Jugoslavije - 70.

N o t e: I Economic Disciplines: Technology, agriculture, forestry, veterinary medicine and economics;

II Non-economic Disciplines: Law, philosophy, philology and medicine.

An approximate estimate of national income shows that the indices for 1950-54 and 1965-69, when taking the period 1935-39 as a basis, have been 160,3 and 448,7.

It is possible to draw two basic conclusions from the data presented. First, that the number of graduates of economic disciplines has increased much faster than the total increase, and that this total increase has been higher than the increase

of the national income; this means that cadres had a very important role in the increase of national income. Second, in the mentioned period the structure of graduates has changed considerably.

While in the pre-War period about two-thirds of students graduated in the disciplines of non-economic character (this fact however does not mean that these graduates were not necessary for economy), in the course of the fifties the number of graduates of economic and non-economic disciplines has been equal, and in the later period the number of those from the economic disciplines has increased. So it is clear that investment into cadres is not performed with the aim that they take public functions in the machinery of government, but increasingly in order that they can be actively involved into the fight for the increase of national income.

Investments into higher education in Yugoslavia still have the character of investment into streamed education. The requirements for the realization of a quick pace of economic development prevent the approaching to higher education from the aspect of augmentation of the level of general culture of population. So, if we consider the situation in the school year 1968/69, an average generation (in a class of a school or in a particular year of study) in the elementary school had 359.000 pupils, in secondary schools 165.400, in higher schools 42.000, and 35.000 on faculties.

Accordingly, if the facts connected to the slower pace of population increase in the latest years, which would only emphasize these conclusions, are neglected, we may conclude that every tenth member of a generation comes to the university, and it is clear that we still have not such a situation

that this kind of education is given to a very large part of population.

Having in mind the above mentioned reasons, it would be necessary to treat investment into higher education as any other investment: it should be profitable in itself and give the augmented means back to the society. When a functional approach to this kind of investment has been accepted, it is also necessary to precise interrelations between the investor and the giver of educational service. The economy as the investor, as well as all public services which need highly qualified cadres, cannot limit their requirements only to get graduated cadres in exchange for the invested resources, but their main goal should be to get cadres capable for solving problems, so that a rapid development and increase of income can be realized. All these facts prove that the economy needs a new, modern university, capable to satisfy the future requirements of society, and that such a university should replace the existing old-fashioned one.

The faculties are particularly interested in the stability of financing their activities. The very function of a higher education institution requires constant and stable resources. When a generation of students is enrolled at a faculty, this faculty takes responsibility for education and initiation into scientific work, lasting four year. The decision made by the investor, or society, cannot represent the only competent factor, but it has to be a mutual agreement, a negotiation on work and financing. The present practice, in which a gross determination of expenses of a faculty still prevails, and calculations of cost of certain expert work orientation are not made, contribute a lot towards a rather unstable position of the financing of faculties.

The last problem belonging to this complex is the definition of bearer of financing of education of cadres and its modality. The process of deetatization which has been started by leaving the system of budgetary financing and transition into financing through funds for education, has been gradually finished by the formation of the community for education. But the basic changes have not yet taken place. The process of determination of resources for higher education is still alienated from their real users - the economy and public services - and they are interested in "double" behavior in such a situation: i.e. to reduce their obligations regarding the communities of education (this appears in the request to "free the economy") and to get at the same time qualified cadres to the expense of society as much as possible, with the orientation to give scholarships only when the shortage of qualified cadres is evident and when it endangers the realization of their business.

The present ways of financing higher education are such that it is still not possible to notice completely their character and to see them as investments. In fact, to enterprises tax has been imposed by their payment of contribution from personal income at an average rate, regardless to the fact whether and to what extent they are in need for cadres, and they have very small influence in decision-making about the kind of cadres to be educated.

The existing communities of education did not complete their tasks: they have remained the distributors of resources given by society, and this process is still realized mainly by the accustomed ways of previously set criteria for allocation of resources, in spite of efforts for introduction of new, more

adequate criteria. In these communities of education the educational institutions and users of education have not been gathered together in such a way as to make possible to start solving important problems in a constructive dialogue. It is clear that it would be necessary to begin with the rearrangement of the existing communities of education and finding new ways for their greater efficiency. This would be indispensable in order to enable the faculties to get, from the financial aspect, the conditions necessary for their self-managing functions. As long as their position is determined by a number of factors having the character of alienation, the autonomous action has no possibilities to be a success.

The reform of faculties and universities on the whole requires different contents and methods, i.e. different teaching devices and teaching staff. But in order to carry out such changes, it would be necessary to acquire mutual agreement between the users of education and the educational institutions. A more qualitative work would probably require more money, as well as the introduction of new streams of instruction at some faculties and different structure of students enrolled at faculties. The present conditions prevent the realisation of such changes and therefore it can be considered that the new quality is required for the development of a true self-management.

The transmission of some functions from the state to the interested work organizations gives much greater opportunities to these organizations to make their requirements and influence the adaptation of contents and methods of teaching to their needs.

While previously facts were mainly thought in higher education, now, the situation has changed owing to the fact that the number of these facts which have to be learnt is

constantly increasing and also to the modernization of the information systems, and teaching has to be based on the methodological-theoretical components of formation of experts.

Starting from these basic assumptions of the process of education, the component of the scientific-theoretical work is stressed, completed by the information system in order to transfer knowledge, as well as by modern methods and techniques of instruction. If a modern university professor should introduce his students into research work, it would be quite understandable that he should do such work, not only in order to acquire the scientific methods, but to achieve results. Naturally, he will include his students to take part in his research. Financial resources would be needed for carrying out such researches. Therefore, the basis of a modern faculty should be a research institute with a much greater number of research workers than teaching "ex catedra" would require.

The introduction of new teaching methods does not imply the lessening of the number of university professors and other co-workers or the diminution of their role. On the contrary, now the role of the teacher is changed so that he has to acquire the technique of research methods in order to be able to transmit his knowledge to his students in a new way. The intensification and individualization of learning to a certain degree would require the augmentation of the teaching and other staff at faculties. The augmentation of the cost of such modern education is justified by its higher quality.

In order that these ideas of the reformed university could be carried out, it will be necessary to change also the attitude towards the financial resources, for without this

change it will not be possible to get such experts who would answer the needs of the modern economy and society in general.

Owing to a constant increase of the number of students and the opening of new university centers, in the course of the former development of education financial resources for higher education have been also constantly increased, but this increase has not been sufficient. Personal expenses which have increased at a higher rate than material expenses in the course of the past years are not sufficient, and therefore it is easy to conclude that material expenses have had a serious degradation. In 1952 material expenses represented over 40% of all expenses in higher education and in 1968 they represented only 19%.

Researches on this decrease of material expenses have shown that they are presently more or less restricted to management expenses, administrative expenses, cleaning and to minimal expenses to teaching. The problem of relationship between the self-managing bodies and distribution of the total income of the faculty is closely related to the mentioned decrease.

In fact in the previous system of financing, since it was not possible to establish a harmony between the expansion of institutions and the constantly increasing number of students, and the available financial resources, the financial policy was such as to satisfy partly the needs of increase of income of working people at the university; the requirements of modern teaching have been satisfied to a much lesser extent.

The economy, which requires considerable investments for the modernization of its own work, has also shown great interest for the decrease of its present social obligations. A poor definition of the access to the problem of social expense has

put education on the list of fields for which resources have been decreased, although, according to its nature it should contribute to the development of production. Only recently it has been realized that the material basis of education should not be decreased.

All the mentioned problems regarding financing are closely connected to the realization of changes at the university. The shortage of financial means cannot be compensated by a normative independence of the faculty. So in order to create adequate conditions for self-management in this field of social work, it would be necessary to solve problems regarding financing.

4. FORMS OF ASSOCIATIONS OF FACULTIES

The problem of association of higher education institutions appears in connection with self-management. The already achieved level of self-management and the intentions towards its further development and independence of higher education institutions, emphasize the responsibility of the school collectives in carring out their duties.

The associations of higher education institutions have been founded on the basis of the General Law on Faculties and Universities from 1960. In the General Law on Higher Education from 1964, the possibility of the foundation of associations of educational institutions has been anticipated. In the republican laws on higher education such a possibility has also been anticipated.

Presently two kinds of associations have been developped besides the university. There are associated higher schools

in accordance with professional stream (f.i. the Association of Higher Technical Schools of SR Serbia) or associations of higher schools and faculties (f.i. the Association of the Faculties of Law and Higher Schools of SR Serbia).

The process of founding associations of faculties and higher schools or higher schools of university level in accordance to professional streaming has started in the course of the school year 1960/61 in SR Serbia. During 1961 several such associations have been founded. Their basic tasks consist in coordination (not the equalization) of the structure and content of syllabi, course of study, transition of students to another higher education institution, financing, etc.

Besides the mentioned type of associations, during the school year 1961/62 the foundation of another type of associations, according to location, has been started. So in SR Slovenia the Association of Higher Schools has been founded and all institutions of higher education have been included into it. This association was aimed to unite all faculties, art academies, higher schools of university level and higher schools from the territory of the republic so that they could solve together their common problems.

The mentioned two types of associations have been founded in a single republic, but at the end of 1961 a so-called Association of Higher Naval Schools has been founded in Rijeka. Five Higher Naval Schools existing at the territory of three republics (Croatia, Slovenia and Montenegro) have been included into this Association and it has been anticipated by the regulations that they will be associated into the "Association of Institutions of Higher Education in Yugoslavia". Immediately

afterwards the Association of Higher Schools of Economic Stream of SFR Yugoslavia has been founded and 23 schools from the whole country have been included. On the inaugural meeting of this Association it has been concluded that those Faculties of Economy having the first level of studies may also become its members.

According to the propositions of regulations these "associations" have the rights of a legal body. The bodies of the association are as follows: the assembly, the management board, the chairmanship, the supervisory board and the secretariate. The Association has its financing plan and is supported by the contribution of its members.

The associated higher education institutions are in the position to solve problems being of their common interest and to act in an organized way, with full professional and political autority before the social community, the governmental bodies, etc. So the association of higher education institutions appears as a factor of democratization and decentralization, with all the corresponding practical consequences.

However, the problem of associating is closely connected with the institution of university, particularly regarding their structure and relations towards faculties.

It can be expected that in the course of the further process of independence of faculties, the voluntary association will be increasing and that all institutions of higher education will be treated equally regarding association. This means that these institutions will have the opportunity to unite into such associations which will suit them most regarding composition and character.

x

x x

The Association of Universities of Yugoslavia has been founded in the period of a complete independence of faculties, stated by the General Law on Universities from 1954, by which social management has been introduced into these institutions. The fully organized cooperation of all universities has been started in January 1957 by the foundation of the Association of Universities of Yugoslavia.

This Association is a self-managing organization in which all problems regarding higher education are discussed, being of mutual interest for universities and other institutions of higher education and the cooperation of all factors interested in solving these problems has been secured.

From the very beginning of its work the Association has taken part in the general action aimed to solve problems regarding higher education instruction, and especially problems regarding the reorganization of this instruction. On its plenary sessions the most important problems regarding higher education have been discussed. In the course of the past years the Association has played an important role in strengthening the cooperation between universities in Yugoslavia, but owing to a unsufficient efficacy of the Association a satisfactory cooperation in some important fields has not been accomplished.

Besides that, the activity of the Association is not wide enough, since it comprises only universities and not higher schools of university level which exist outside the universities (12), art academies (14), independent faculties which are not part of a university (f.i. the Faculty of Law in Split) and higher schools (13) and there is not another association in which they could be included.

The tasks of the Association consist in discussing and acquiring attitudes regarding the following: problems of instruction and research work and the rational coordination of the systems of studies, especially at faculties of some kind; textbooks and other devices necessary for the contemporary instruction and problems regarding securing financial means for the work of the university; problems of distribution of personal incomes of teaching and other staff on universities.

The Association realizes its goals by agreements, recommendations, opinions and similar acts. Its members are obliged to act in accordance with its conclusions if these conclusions refer to their rights and obligations as set by its statute.

The Association has collective bodies, isolated and consultative bodies. The collective bodies are the following: the Assembly and the Chairmanship. There are also commissions, committees and boards. At the Chairmanship there are the following permanent commissions, committees and boards: Commission dealing with problems of organization, Commission for scientific and research work, Commission for International Relations, Commission for problems of financing, Organizational Committee of the International Seminar "University Today" (Univerzitet danas), Committee for the Seminar for Slavists from Foreign Countries and the Editorial Board of the magazine issued by the Association, entitled "Univerzitet danas" (University Today).

Since the number of higher education institutions and especially higher schools has increased considerably, the question of the change in structure of the Association of Universities of Yugoslavia has been discussed, so that it could change into an Association of Institutions of Higher Education in Yugoslavia. Besides the universities (in which faculties and some schools of university level are included) the new Association would include art academies, higher schools of university level and higher schools.

Chapter IV

Discussion

As it has been described in the previous chapter, the theoretical conception of the university self-management has been developed, in the legislature it has got its juridical basis, on which the specific structure of self-managing organs of faculties and university has been established, respectively the structure of specific forms of free faculty association based on their mutual interests. At the same time it has been pointed out that the establishing of self-managing relations has been developed on specific financial basis, which, due to its narrowness, sometimes prevents the real development of self-managing relations.

At that place only the facts have been mentioned, and on the basis of them research work as results of the undertaken only the feasible statements.

Of course, it doesn't mean that these questions have been definite or conclusive. On the contrary, the majority of statements, in fact, represents only "snapshotting" of a very complex development, at the end of 1970.

But, on the majority of questions discussions continue to be carried out, dilemmas are still existing and measures for their solutions have been proposed. So, for instance, relations between faculties and the university self-managing organs have still been discussed, as well as the interrelations of faculty and university organs, the relations between faculty and broader social community. Contents and methods of decision-making in self-managing organs and the like have been examined, as well.

In this chapter, therefore, the mentioned questions are going to be treated less from the standpoint of existing conditions, but more from the interested groups and individuals` standpoint. In this connection, the special place is given to opinions and attitudes of direct participants.

1. RELATION BETWEEN GOVERNMENT ORGANS AND HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

In consideration of this problem it should be emphasised that due to self-managing character of higher education institutions, the relation between them on one hand, and authority and administrative organs on the other hand, has been considerably changed.

The mentioned characteristics is explicitly shown in relations between administrative organs and higher education institutions. In Yugoslav system higher education institutions are not linked to the respective administrative organs. There are only some cases when executive body can decide on certain questions for which it is juridically entitled. It is comprehensible that in such a case the executive body acts as authority body (for instance, the Republic Executive Council being an agent of Republic Assembly). Exceptions could be possible only when management of social affairs of general importance is in question. Only in exceptional cases such management can be entrusted to administrative organs. Typical example is found in the field of statistics. Naturally, an organization could act as an administrative organ only within the legislative authority. The organization can have these rights to certain higher education institutions as well as to their associations.

Because of the mentioned circumstances the influence of administrative organs has been changed, even one could say, that it has disappeared. Organization of higher education, its basic forms, its terms and objectives have been in principle determined by authority organs. Besides these basic rights, the administrative organs, in principle, as well as in practice, have very narrow competences. It should be mentioned that a new quality of relationship between interested communities and higher education institution has appeared. In the present system organs of community of interest can't be considered as special forms of administrative organs.

It is not insisted that organization of higher education or its characteristics should be in principle unified in all Republics. Self-managing system allows different approaches, even within one republic organization. It is not necessary for all higher education centers in one republic to be unitary regulated. Republican laws, already now, give opportunities for different organizational unities.

Tasks which are in the domaine of administrative organs don't originate so much from law but from those tasks which they, as professional services, are entrusted with by authority and executive organs.

Besides, it should be underlined that a great part of organizational activity is out of authority organs co-operative decision scope.

Organization of management at higher education institutions has its specific characteristics. These characteristics, together with tasks of higher education institutions, which only these institutions must take care of and feel responsible for inevitably diminish possible influence of administrative organs on the higher education institutions work.

Because of the great social interest for higher education institutions` work the legislator provides for participation of society representatives in self-management organs. Because of the importance of the work and objective of existence of these institutions their function must be directed by the society. This leading role has been realized in authority organs and interested community organs` rights which in some questions supplement each others.

Talking about these problems, which is quite new, the fact that students take part in the self-management process shouldn't avoided. This fact causes the changes in former relations between higher education institutions and administrative organs. The new forms of relations in management in education have begun to appear in this field.

x

x x

The consequence of self-management at higher education institution is that in the number of their works they have become autonomans, that is, the former relation between them and administrative organs have been changed by relations between them and various authority organs (including community of interest organs, as well).

The influence of republic authority organs on the work of higher education institution is very important. Especially, if we have in mind that organization of higher education institutions is in the competence of the Republic. Of course, this is valid for those higher education institutions whose organisation is directly regulated by the Republic (for instance the university). Therefore by juridical republic regulations

Republic is given direct right to establish higher education institutions. This right is in the competence of the higest Republic organ.

In the case the higher education institutions is established by the municipality, or Assembly then it should fulfill all cadre and work program requirements.

This reffers, first of all, to the verification of some institutions. This is, in principle, carried out by Republic administrative organs, which are competent organs for administration and authority.

So, for instance, the republic administrative organs have in their competence preparation and formation of corresponding standards, which must be fulfilled by the institution if it has to be recognized as the institution of higher education. In the case when, for instance, faculty or university themselves establish an institution (for example an university institute) the administrative organ, at its registration could establish the fact that its standards have not been fulfilled.

It should be considered that Republic secretariat for education prepares the basis for authority organs` decisions,, that is for the executive organs. The mentioned problems refer to establishment of higher education institutions, but it doesn`t mean that republic organs couldn`t be competent in other circumstances - for instance in the question of further existance of some institution or of expansion of its activity.

The general characteristics of self-management at higher education institutions is primarily this: interventions of administrative organs have been changed by self-managing decisions and by rights of authority and executive

organs. It is very important to stress out that for the sake of self-management, Republic authority, that is, its executive organs, and not the administrative ones, perform a kind of social "supervision" (of course, when juridical requirements are met) of higher education institutions work.

Because of the character of higher education work executive organs have definite rights even when self-managing organs are formed. But not in respect of their form, number etc., but primarily in respect of structure of the highest institution organ, that is, its council. Republic authority organ could make its requirements in respect of needs and organization of pedagogical work and the quality of cadre. This also indicates to the already mentioned shifting from the sphere of administrative decision - making to the sphere of self-managing deciding.

The same important area of Republic authority organs is their competence in deciding upon forms and procedures of association.

The Republic Assembly performs its rights by verifying faculties` and their associations` statutes. At the same time all eventual statute changes made in further development of some institutions or associations are varified, too. On the basis of this essential right the Republic Assembly can influence the organization of higher education studies, its extensiveness, its scientific research work, as well as a set of other questions of this area.

Such kind of mechanism the legislator`s intentions can be realized by the way of self-management, without any interference of authority organs and their decisions. It means

that self-managing sphere of higher education institutions is free from administrative organs both in the area of management and area of organization.

All this shows that self-management of higher education institutions can be limited only by exceptional interventions of authority organs. These cases are explicitly enacted by law. It should be mentioned too that it happens only in questions which are of a special concern of the society. Solution of some of these questions can be entrusted by the Republic Assembly to its Executive Council. Republic legislator decides which questions are to be dealt with by the Republic executive organ. Such division of competences affirms the statement that, with exception of really rare cases, self-management rights of higher education institutions are not limited by the right of authority organs, that is, their executive organs. To make the thing more clear it should said that all other kinds of regulations valid for other working organization are valid for higher education institutions, as well.

At the end, one should mention the relation between community, of interests, financed by higher education institutions and the university. Financing system through communities of education very clearly shows that even in the are of financing the administrative relations between the financier and consumer of resources don`t exist any more. Although, due to importance of problems, communities of interests have a strong influence on the life and work of the institutions, still, these relations also in the area of financing, have a sign of self-managing regulations.

The former budget financing has been replaced now with the new form. Nevertheless, financing of higher education institutions can be even combined; so that a number of factors take part in financing. But this doesn't influence the general facts related to the change of relations in financing. It is characteristic that the financier can have a number of other rights in respect of higher education institutions which, in the majority of cases, could be defined as "advisory", but which, together with Republic organs decision making, could influence problems' solving at higher education institutions. This role becomes evident primarily in establishment of new higher education institutions. So, the rights of associations financing higher education represent in regard of their financial basis the foundation of self-management at faculty or university.

The above statements roughly indicate that self-management of higher education institutions is in principle not capable of being joined with interventions and rights of administrative organs. These interventions could be very exceptional. Former administrative relations should be replaced by corresponding relations between self-managing organs of the institutions and authority organs and their executive organs, and in that respect the important changes have taken place.

2. MUTUAL RELATIONS OF SELF-MANAGING ORGANS OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES (UNIVERSITY)

Relations among some higher education institutions have been anticipated by the fundamental regulations on institution associations, in general. Even from legislative and formal point of view, probably it would be very difficult to defend, today some other organization form than the university representing a community of faculties and other autonomous institutions. Heterogeneous faculty work process in practice inevitably requires adapted organization form of work and management of each institution. So, the result is that heterogeneous organism is rather difficult to be managed centrally. However, without any damage for self-management, community of faculty (university) is capable of undertaking a series of mutual tasks of associated institutions.

The question, what the community (university) should be entrusted to decide upon depends on the kind and number of united organizations in it. In this respect the differences among some communities could be very great.

When communities` licenses towards its all members are evaluated, regulations on working organization management should be taken into account. In spite of the opinion that principles valid for the industry can`t be automatically transferred to the sphere of educational institutions, some principles can`t be avoided, because they have already been established in self-management process and they refer to work organizations in general. The latest constitution amendments bring in some news in this respect. The process of self-management should be as close to the working-man as possible. Such a requirement can cause some difficulties in organization, if

rather heterogeneous organism is wanted to be organized in an excessively homogeneous way. Therefore, in order to organize the university in such way that, on the one hand the rights of working-man, as well as principles of self-management at university are protected, and on the other hand certain relations among members of the community, both in self-managing and organizational respect are established, the forms have to be searched for. In other words, the nature of these relations, as well as their rights should be regulated.

It should be emphasised once more that it would be difficult to make a unique scheme of community organization, because conditions in Republics are different. This question has by Republic laws been solved differently. However, it is obvious that solutions can't evade the common rules concerning questions of work organization authonomy and working-men rights in these organization. Beside, it should be pointed out that financing of education on the whole has been transfered to Republics. However, the amount of financial resources influences the structure of organization. And the organization can represent rather "loose" unity of certain members, and in that case it has small mutual competences; but it can be organized more "firmly".

Some questions having different aims set by the community, can be solved differently, for instance, should the community rights be limited only to the "representative" activity (representing the community, giving honorary doctorates) or should the community have other more powerful juridical competences by which it ties (obligated) all its members. From the right aspect it should be said that the community, first of all, has the role of "representative" which in fact has no

influence on any question concerning its members. Therefore, the question is whether such form of community is appropriate today, when number of common problems appear, the problems which are councited with one another and which are necessary for cadre preparation and research work development.

It is not acceptable an extreme, when university community should be the carrier of the number of basic self-managing competences, which could be performed only by working organizations. Community can't perform those rights which, by law, are explicitly acknowledged to the work organization, that is to working people.

University organisation in the form of a community, necessarily is connected with the question of self-management organization within the community and within some community members. The question of self-managing organs of the community is connected with it. It is not necessary that all members of community should have the same organs. In organization of self-management in a certain institution the specific nature of its organization must become evident. This is directly linked to the second question, that is, how far the Republic legislator is allowed to encroach upon the organization principles. In other words, is legislator competent to issue the compulsory scheme of self-managing organs for certain organizations which are going to unite in the community? He certainly has this right in relation to the community which has no character of work organization. This is one of the basic questions: what amount of rights could be transfared from a certain working organization to some organizm which has not the character of work organization?

As it has already been mentioned, organization of some faculties and other organizations united into community can't be always the same. Reasons are different, for instance: homogenecit, or heterogencity of faculties, as well as heterogancity of scope of work; number of students, development of research work and its developing plans, etc. These would represent some outside signs of phenomena which, to a certain degree, could influence the way of self-management organization within the certain member of the community. Efficiency in self-management organization of bigger faculties can impose the specific solutions. In some organizations, beside the known "standard" organs, others, up-to-now unknown kinds in this area, could be established.

The following question could be put: how does the strong unity with some organization in industry influence the self-management organization? Such a unity can, to a certain extent, be against too strong unity within the university. In such cases, when organs of the certain organizations are concerned, the question is: will the strong unity of interests be expressed only in the scheme of external work organization participation through its representatives in the university Council? Probably, participation on the basis of financial resources and program of work will impose the participation in some other organs, as well.

All mentioned circumstances which exist in self-management organization of the higher education institutions show that the scheme of self-management organization could be made only in principle. However, all more detailed decisions should be, in accordance with University amendments, left to a work organization. It should organize the self-management of working people so that it is most effective, and at the same time so that it could be reached by as great number of work

organization-members, as possible.

Here, we should point out the relations between organs of the individual organization and community. First of all, it should be stressed that community is a juristic organ, but not a work-organization. The community will have its self-managing organs adapted to its own role. The basic organs of the community can be established by the Republic law. But their competences can't be fixed in details by law. So, beside the organs fixed by law, the community can have a number of other organs, first of all, the accessory ones. All organs of the community fulfil tasks which are in details fixed by community statute. These can be: matters which are given up to the community by its community-members.

If community performs common jobs for its members, then conclusions of the competent community organs should be valid for the community-members, as well. Great number of community tasks probably would not directly oblige the community-members, but the community solutions would be more of "consultative" nature or will be of an "informative" character. If there is no evidence of competence in its statute, the community will not be able to oblige directly its members in solving a number of common questions. Therefore, a question about relations between community self-managing organs and their organizations arises.

A theoretical question is: how to define in self-managing acts the areas and competences, which some organizations surrender to the community, or more precisely, to its organs. The problem is whether it is sufficient only to indicate competences in the community statute, or to mention in statutes of individual organizations that some competences are

surrendered to the community. Is the transfer of self-managing rights is in question here, the second solution is better. It would be more difficult to imagine that the community act, could, without right of surrender directly oblige an organization to obey rules passed by the community. Exceptions are those cases in which the Republic legislator directly imposes the definite community tasks and where from the juristic point of new the conflict of competences between the community and individual organization is out of the question.

At last, a question is: which organ should perform the community decisions? It is considered to be that one which, on the basis of statute regulations, is competent to perform analogous decisions of self-managing organs in the organization.

3. RELATIONS BETWEEN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIETY; POSITION OF SOCIAL REPRESENTATIVES IN SELF-MANAGEMENT; POSITION OF STUDENTS-PARTICIPANTS IN SELF-MANAGEMENT

As higher education institutions are"institutions of a special social concern, interested citizens and representatives of organizations and the social community" could take part in their management (Article No.90 of Yugoslav Constitution - 1963). This Constitution regulation has replaced the previous Constitutional and legislative obligation (from the period of social management 1954-1963). that higher education institutions should include society representatives in their council.

The essential intention of inclusion of society representatives into self-managing organs at higher education institutions was to stress that the education is combined with other areas of social work. This has been the essential constitution principle, although, in practice, we still could find examples of "etatistic opinions that through these representatives the society should secure its influence on the work of higher education institutions, that is, it should be " the institutions of social supervision - specific in its form."

Participation of social community representatives in the faculty management has been stated in the statutes of higher education institutions. In statutes of higher education institutions, by the separate article, it has been established, that " in faculty management representatives of social community take their part." In the article which deals with structure of higher education institutions' council, usually, socio-politic body are explicitly mentioned, as well as work and social organizations which send their representatives. As typical representatives of " public interest" are considered members of the University Council. They are appointed by Republic Town or municipality Assemblies, and representatives of industry, social services and social organizations are treated as deputies of socio-economic and professional interests, or of more narrow interests of some categories of citizens.

Analysis of Republic laws on higher education, of faculty statutes and their work, however, shows that the role of social representatives in self-managing faculty organs has been more or less formal. The participation of social representatives was rarely used by Republics and municipality for

" social supervision ", and industry and social services, or faculties themselves as the factor of integration into the basic structure of social work.

In laws on higher education and in faculty statutes the competences and responsibilities of society representatives in self-managing organs have not been worked out in details; either their obligations to social bodies and associations which have named or delegated them, this caused the participation of social representatives in these organs to be in most cases, considered only formality.

In conditions when faculties, while planning and making programs for professional cadre education, as well as for research work, were not strictly asked to consider the real needs of industry and social services, and when financing, although dectatized, still had the budget character, these social representatives in fact, had not special needs to be more engaged. And they behaved in that way. At the majority of faculties their participation at the Council meetings was very irregular. According to the opinion of interviewed members of Faculty Councils, this category was not specially useful in self-management, but didn't hinder the work of faculty council, either.

In analysis of structure and effectiveness of self-management organs in services out of the industry, which were carried out before the Second Congress of workers'

self-management (1970)[17] it was found out that opportunity for society interests representation was not fulfilled, either formally or really. When justification of social representatives participants was discussed, the following answer was given: representatives of social interest in self-managing organs in out of industry services " are necessary" but in the case where their function was considered as social control, it should be changed. Social representatives in faculty self-managing organs should support faculty interests in the organs and organization which have delegated them; and through them faculties should realize more direct, more developed relations with socio-political community assemblies.

In that way social representatives in self-managing organs at institutions of higher education could find their " raison d`être".

Still, the most numerous are those institutions of higher education in which teaching staff makes decisions on the essential work problems. Teaching staff has the greatest number of its members not only on the Faculty Teachers`Boards,

---

17) Samoupravljanje radnih organizacija društvenih delatnosti u SR Sloveniji -- Saopštenje Republičkog odbora Sindikata društvenih delatnosti -- Self-management of social services work organization in SR of Slovenia -- Report of Republic Board of Trade Union, Ljubljana, Okt.1970, pp.13-14.

Tavčar: Samoupravljanje u radnim organizacijama društvenih delatnosti; - Self-management in social services work organization, Belgrade, November,1970.,pp 16-19.

but even on the Faculty Council. The other categories of representatives: technical and administration staff, students and representatives of social community partly take part in management or are only of marginal character.

In the structure of 12 faculty councils, taken out of the sample of higher education institutions

-Teaching staff is represented by	54,72%	of all members
-Social community representatives	25,10%	" "
-Students	14,00%	" "
-Other type of personnel	6,18%	" "

Structure of Faculty Boards:

-Teaching staff	87,27%	" "
-Students	8,80%	" "
-Other type of personnel	3,73%	" "

A little more adequate structure of faculty councils from the self-management principles point of view, is found at faculties of University in Skoplje. At 9 faculties of this University out of 294 members of the Council

195 or 54,06% were teaching staff and other personnel
68 or 23,14% were students, and
67 or 22,80% social community representatives.

Already these data show that different categories of representatives are differently represented on councils, which are the main organs of self-management at faculties.

x

x x

In regard of the number, lately, the students have been represented in councils nearby equally with other social com-munity representatives.

Up to 1968 they were group with less number of repre-sentatives - only 2-3 out of average 30 numbers on councils. Since then the number of students` representatives is in con-stant rise, and shows the tendency to reach parity. In 1968 on 231 Councils of higher education institutions students made 9,86% out of the total number of council members. The percen-tage of students on Faculty board is increasing since then. The example of Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade approves this tendency. On the board for " the New School " which was formed by the working community of this faculty, on November 1970, one third of board members were professors, one third were students and one third the young architects, faculty former students.

However, the real position, rights and responsibilities of students in self-management in practice, as well as the normative documents, have been changed more slowly than the number of students in self-managing organs. According to the faculty`s law and its statutes, the students are not the members of working organization. In self-management they have more or less the same status and treatment as society represen-tatives. Article No.170 of the Electrotechnical Faculty Statute (in Zagreb) reads for instance: " The representatives of social community don`t take part in decision-making when Faculty Council decides on its the inner organization and income distribution. Members of the Councils voted by students don`t take part in decision-making on income distribution."

But, this regulation doesn't say that students have the right to decide on inner organization problems. Article No.180 of the same Statute precises only the consultive role of students' representatives. That is: " Students'representatives have the right to take part on Faculty Teachers'Board meetings, when questions on instruction, studies, financial conditions of students or some other important questions for students concerns are discussed; here the students are allowed to say their opinions and proposals."

Students'participation in self-management of higher education institutions still is of the representative character. Students'position, rights and responsibilities in self-management are in the greatest number of faculties as usual. This could be seen from the following data of the poll conducted within the scope of this research work:

- only 12% of the total number of examined students have taken part on the Faculty working community meetings in 1969/70 school year, and 93,45% of all students consider they should be equal members of the Faculty working community;

- something more than the half of the examined students (50,30%) consider that students should be members of the Faculty working community and have a right to take decisions on all questions concerning faculty (except distribution of income), and 40,96% think they should have a right to decide only about problems in which students are directly interested;

- only in 5,71% of cases the examined students consider that students' proposals had influence on self-management organs' decisions, 30,20% believe they had influence, and 63,39% students either believed they had no influence or they didn't answer the question. A percentage of students

who didn't answer the following question: what were reasons for their proposals not to influence decisions of self-managing organs -- was 44,79%; and 35,20% of them think that the reason lies in the existance of powerful group of participants who prepare decisions in advance and they are accepted;

- about professor-students relations 22,22% of all examined students say that they are satisfactory, and 48,80% consider them to be fairly satisfactory.

Former practice shows the exceptional students' interest for some concrete solutions in the instruction process - mainly about number of lessons, examination terms and conditions for passing from one school year to another which has connection with some rights which students accomplish out of the universi' social and health security, children's allowance and the like.

In other faculty matters, students' participation is less developed, and it could be said that certain degree of indifference exists, which is a problem of its own.

In order to get better picture of students position in self-management organs three questions of basic importance for their status in self-management have been put to them.

The first question was: In discussions on development of self-management system has been said that students should be members of the Faculty working community. Do you consider it is necessary?

a) Yes
b) No

Results of the answers:

	Teacher	Other personnel	Students	Total
Yes	523(78,12)	153(66,81)	1013(93,45)	1689(85,51)
No	126(20,07)	61(26,64)	45(4,15)	232(11,81)
Without answer	12(1,81)	15(6,55)	26(2,40)	53(2,68)
Total:	661 (100%)	229 (100%)	1084 (100%)	1974 (100%)

Second question was: If you think the students should be the members of faculty working community name with what rights:

a) with a right to decide on all questions

b) with a right to decide on all question except on distribution of income;

c) with a right to decide about study problems and in general about students' questions;

d) with capacity of giving only proposals

e) .....

R e s u l t s:

Answer	Teachers	Other Personnel	Students	T o t a l
a	57(8,62)	15(6,55)	296(27,30)	368(18,64)
b	72(10,89)	25(10,09)	249(23,oo)	346(17,52)
c	321(48,41)	94(41,o5)	444(40,96)	859(43,51)
d	86(13,o1)	34(15,oo)	43(3,96)	163(8,25)
Something else	11(1,66)	2(0,88)	4(0,37)	17(0,86)
They should not be members of working community without answ.	114(17,41)	59(26,43)	48(4,41)	221(11,22)
T o t a l:	661 (100%)	229 (100%)	1084 (100%)	1974 (100%)

Third question: If you think students should be the members of the Faculty working community should:

a) all students belong to it (including part-time students)
b) all full-time students.
c) only students from the second year on,
d) only students who regularly pass their exams
e) only students' representatives
f) .....

R e s u l t s:

Answer	Teachers	Other Personnel	Students	T o t a l
a	39 (5,90)	7 (3,05)	184 (16,97)	230 (11,65)
b	65 (9,83)	18 (7,86)	288 (26,57)	371 (18,79)
c	35 (5,30)	6 (2,62)	126 (10,70)	167 (8,45)
d	160 (24,05)	48 (20,96)	139 (12,82)	347 (17,58)
e	220 (33,28)	74 (32,71)	281 (25,92)	575 (29,22)
Something else and without answer	142 (21,64)	76 (32,80)	66 (7,02)	284 (14,31)
Total:	661 (100%)	229 (100%)	1084 (100%)	1974 (100%)

Results of the answers to the first question have shown that the majority of all categories examinees consider that students too should be the members of the Faculty working community, that is, they should take part in self-management organs. Such opinion have 85,51% of all examinees, respectively 78,12% of all teachers and assistant-teachers, 66,81% of

administrative personnel and 93,45% of students. So, not only students, but the other categories of working people pledge for the students' right to participate in self-management system.

The second question referred to their rights and competences. In that respect there are greater differences in students' and other people's opinions. Students would like to have the right to decide on all questions (27,30%), that is on all except the distribution of income (23,00%). These two answers got together 50,30% of students' votes. But, teachers gave to these answers only 19,51% of their votes, and administrative and other personnel even less - 16,64% votes. The greatest number of votes in all categories got the answer c., that is, the right of students to decide only on students' questions. These answer was chosen by 40,41% teachers and assistants, 41,05% of technical and administrative staff and 40,96% of students or total of 43,51% of all examinees.

The third question dealt with the choice of students who should take part in self-management organs. The greatest number of examinees took the answer " only students'representatives ". This answer was chosen by 33,28% of teachers and assistants, 32,71% of administrative staff; 24,05% of teacher and 20,96% of technical and administrative staff chose the answer that only students who pass their exams regularly should take an active part in self-management. This answer was chosen by 12,82% of students, too. But, differently from teachers, technical and administrative staff, the high percentage of students think that these rights should be given to all students without any exception - 11,65%, to all full-time students, - 18,79%, to all students from the second year

on -- 8,45%. When these results have been gathered together the percentage has become to 38,89%. Teachers have rarely chosen this answer, that is only in 21.03% cases; and technical and administrative staff still less -- in 13,53% of cases.

Generalizing these results, it can be concluded that the majority of examinees agrees that students should take part in self-management, but because of the great number of students only their representatives should be taken in, and only those better ones, those who pass their exams regularly; and their rights and competences in managing organs should refer to matters of the students' interests, for instance instruction and other students problems.

x

x x

The basic pedagogical relations among different categories of participants and interested factors in higher education institutions on the principles of the real self-management have been clearing their way, yet. This is a long term historical process. In that process it is necessary to take away the causes which had led to the authoritative relations and to the hierarchy, and it is necessary to establish such new conditions in which new relations will appear.

4. FORMS OF SELF-MANAGEMENT

In higher education, as well as in other areas of social work the direct forms of self-management exist - in them all members of the institution take part and, beside them there are indirect forms in which only chosen members of the institutions take part. Taking into consideration the character of higher education and the different categories of participants in this area the question arises: which forms should have priority. In the respect of normative regulations both forms could be found. In order to get a more precise answer to this question, it was necessary to get acquainted with opinions and attitudes of the direct participants in self-management at faculties. By the means of a questionnaire they were asked the following question: " Taking into account the character of self-management at higher education which forms should be given the priority:

a) the direct forms of self-management;
b) the indirect forms of self-management.

The answers were as follows:

	Teachers	Other Personnel	Students	T o t a l
The direct forms	370(56,oo)	127 (55,45)	825(76,1o)	1322(66,96)
The indirect forms	247(37,34)	70(30,55)	216(19,94)	533(26,96)
Unknown	44(6,66)	32(14,oo	43(3,96)	119(6,08)
T o t a l:	661 (100%)	229 (100%)	1084 (100%)	1974 (100%)

Majority of two thirds (66,96%) voted for direct forms of hither education self-management. Priority to the indirect forms of self-management was given by 26,96% of examinees, that is 37,34% of teachers and assistants, 30,35% of administrative staff and 19,94% of students. The other examinees (6,08%) didn't give any answer to this question.

In order to check to what extent the real condition is is accordance with the examinees' wishes the forth question in the questionnaire was formulated as follows:

In which self-managing organ at your faculty the most important decisions for life and work of the whole community have been made ?

a) at the Annual Meeting of the institution
b) at the Meeting of the Faculty working community
c) on the Faculty Council
d) on the Executive Board
e) on the Faculty Teachers' Board
f) on the Students' Committees of the year (departments)
g) ....

R e s u l t s:

	Teaching Staff	Other Personnel	Students	Total
a) at the Ann. Meeting	17 (2,55)	8 (3,48)	226 (20,84)	251 (12,72
b) at the Meeting of the Working Community	102 (15,43)	36 (15,70)	42 (3,88)	180 (9,12)
c) on the Faculty Council	166 (25,11)	96 (41,90)	260 (24,oo)	522 (26,4!
d) on the Executive Board	45 (6,80)	20 (8,72)	25 (2,3o7)	90 (4,56)
e) on the Faculty Teachers'Board	288 (34,57)	41 (17,54)	190 (17,53)	519 (26,29
f) on the Students' Comm.of the year	5 (0,79)	5 (2,10)	144 (13,28)	154 (7,80)
g) some other organs	38 (5,75)	9 (4,oo)	30 (2,8o)	77 (3,9o)
h) unknown	oo (0,oo)	14 (6,56)	167 (15,37)	181 (9,17)
T o t a l:	661 (100%)	229 (100%)	1084 (100%)	1974(100%)

The results show that the real situation at institutions of higher education differs from the examinees` wishes. Their wishes in 66,96% were for direct form of self-management. Only 26,96% of examinees votes for indirect form. Nevertheless, stating which organs decide on the most important decisions for the whole institution, examinees have said only in 12,72% cases that it is the meeting of the Faculty working community, being the organ of direct self-management. Both forms of direct management - the Annual Meeting and the Meeting of the Working community - got the total of 21,84% of answers. According to examinees` opinion it means that the most important decisions are made by the organs of indirect self-management and firstly, on the Faculty Council - 26,44% of answers, on the Faculty Teachers` Board - 26,29% of answers, on the Executive Board - 4,56% of answers, on the students`committees of year, departments etc.,- 7,80% of answers and by other organs - 3,90% of answers. According to the examinees` answers the most important decisions are made by the Faculty Council and the Faculty Teachers` Board, which are forms of indirect management, and not by organs of direct management, in spite of the fact that majority of two-thirds was for these managing organs. Although work of direct self-management is very difficult to be organized at the faculty with great number of teachers and students, the work should be undertaken towards greater affirmation of direct forms of self-management.

Because of the specific character of self-management at the higher education, participants in self-management can take their decisions in several ways:

a. all on all question
b. all on essential (common) questions
c. each category only on its own specific, professional questions
d. some categories can decide only about questions in their competence.

In order to get the attitude of direct participants on these problems (known under the title "competency principle") they were asked appropriate question.

After summarized answers the following results have been gor:

	Teaching Staff	Other Personnel	Students	Total
a) all on all questions	56(8,47)	28(12,20)	182(16,73)	266(13,50)
b) all on common questions	317(47,96)	93(40,60)	484(44,61)	984(45,20)
c) only on their own profession. questions (competences)	25(3,78)	29(12,70)	105(9,74)	159(8,oo)
T o t a l:	661 (100%)	229 (100%)	1084 (100%)	1974(100%)

Only the first answer "all on all questions" is not in accordance with the "competence principle", and it has been chosen only in 13,50% of cases. It was accepted by teaching staff with 8,47%, by the administrative staff with 12,20% and by students with 16,73%. Obviously all categories of examinees in majority accept the competence principle. If we summarize the answers under b, c, d, then the competence principle is accepted by teaching staff in 87,75% of cases, by administrative

staff in 75,10% and by students in 73,53% of cases, and by all categories in 78,50% of cases, which means more than three thirds of all examinees.

In order to compare such examinees` attitude with real conditions we tried to test it on the example of instruction. Therefore, the following question was put: Which self-managing organs at your faculty have the greatest influence on the instruction development ? Examinees were free to list the organs which, in their opinion, had the greatest influence on the instruction development,

The following results were got:

	Teaching Staff	Other Personnel	Students	Total
The Faculty Council	212 (33,73)	41 (17,9o)	160 (14,73)	413(20,9
The Committee of the year	73 (11,o4)	4 (1,78)	113 (10,43)	190(9,62)
The Faculty Teachers` Board	49 (7,41)	28 (12,23)	83 (7,65)	160(8,1o)
The Instruction commission	75 (11,34)	5 (2,18)	35 (3,23)	116(5,82)
The Executive Board	15 (2,27)	4 (1,78)	37 (3,41)	56(2,83)
The Faculty Assemb.	3 (0,45)	1 (0,43)	18 (1,19)	17(0,86)
Some other organs	45 (6,80)	4 (1,78)	39 (3,59)	88(4,45)
without answer	352 (53,25)	163(71,17)	810 (74,77)	1325(67
T o t a l:	824 (126,29)	250(109,25)	1290(119,oo)	2364(119,7

According to the examinees` answers the greatest influence to instruction development has the Faculty Council, then Committees of the year, and after them the Faculty Teachers` Board, the Instruction Commission, the Executive Board, and

the Faculty Assembly, which in general, is in accordance with competence principle. It is surprising that a great number of examinees haven't answer this question, which shows that they have not clear insight into the work of all self-managing organs. Answers given on the work of the Instruction commission affirm it. Teaching staff have given relatively enough answers, but other categories don't know their competence and therefore they rarely mentioned them. The total of answers is higher than 100 because some of examinees have mentioned greater number of organs.

The further investigation has searched for the answer to which extent the examinees had taken part or have been taking part in the work of organs of direct self-management (these organs or forms of self-management are established by regulations and therefore they are common for all institutions of higher education. They are the following: 1. the Faculty Council; 2. The Executive Board; 3. The Faculty Board; 4. The Faculty Teachers'Board). Therefore the examinees'were asked the following question:

Were you, or are you now the member of any of the mentioned self-management organs?

a) the Faculty Council
b) the Faculty Teachers' Board
c) the Executive Board
d) the Committee of the Year
e) .....

Answers have given the following results:

The Faculty Council	171(25,87)	35(15,28)	25(2,3o)	231(11,70)
The Faculty Teachers`Board	357(54,o2)	24(10,46)	15(1,38)	396(20,o6)
The Executive Board	74(11,2o)	12(5,23)	13(1,2o)	99(5,o1)
The Committee of the Year	215(32,52)	12(5,23)	125(11,56)	352(17,83)
Some other organs	28(4,23)	17(7,42)	91(8,38)	136(6,89)
They are not members or without answers	152(23,oo)	135(58,95)	815(75,18)	1102(55,82)
T o t a l:	997(150,84)	235(102,57)	1084(100%)	2316(117,3

The results have shown that in organs of direct management teaching staff is in the greatest number. Because some of them take part in several organs, the percentage of their participation is 127.84%, in spite of the fact that 23% of teachers and their assistants declared not having participation in those organs. Participation of administrative and other personnel is considerably smaller, the total of 43,62%, and 58,95% don`t take part in these organs` work. The students are represented in the smallest number in organs of indirect self-management. They gave the positive answer in 24,82% of cases and the negative one in 75,18% of cases. In total 61,49% of answers affirms the participation in organs of indirect management, and 55,82% of answers of all examinees waive the participation. The total of answers in higher than 100 because some examinees take part in several organs.

In order to establish the priority of participation in self-management in a way it is really reflected in some organs, direct participants were asked the following question:

In which self-managing organ is your real participation in faculty self-management reflected ?

a) on the Committee of the Year
b) on the Faculty Teachers` Board

c) on the Executive Board
d) on the Faculty Council
e) in commissions of these organs
f) .....

The results were as follows:

	Teaching Staff	Other personnel	Students	Total
On the Committees of groups	154(23,3o)	14(6,11)	437(40,31)	605(30,64)
On the Facultyve Teachers's Board	183(27,7O)	25(10,91)	45(4,15)	253(12,81)
On the Exec. Board	32(4,84)	12(5,24)	10(0,92)	54(2,73)
Faculty's Council	110(16,64)	26(11,34)	26(2,39)	162(8,20)
Commissions of these organs	151(22,86)	30(13,oo)	29(2,67)	210(10,63)
Some other organs	31(4,50)	25(10,91)	38(3,50)	94(4,76)
Without the answer	129(19,51)	114(50,oo)	499(46,o6)	742(37,53)
T o t a l:	790(119,35)	246(107,51)	1084(100%)	2120(107)

The percentage of the real participation in organs of indirect self-management is rather high. If all organs are considered, then the percentage of teaching staff and their assistants is 99,84%, of administrative and other personnel 57,51% and of students 46,06%; the total of all categories is 69,77%. If organs are analized one by one, then teaching staff and their assistants are on the Faculty Teachers` Board mostly represented, then on the Committee of the Year, in commissions, on the Faculty Council, the Executive Board. Administrative and other personnel are represented mostly in commissions, then on the Faculty Council, on the Faculty Teachers`Board, Committee of the Year or the Groups and at last on the Executive Board. Students are represented mostly in Committee of the year (group), and then on the Faculty Teachers`Board, in some other organs, Commissions of those organs, on the Faculty Council and at last on the Executive Board.

5. WORK CONTENT OF SELF-MANAGING ORGANS; METHOD OF THEIR DECISION-MAKING; POSITION AND THE WAY OF ENGAGEMENT OF SOME PARTICIPANTS

In order to get data on work content and funcioning of faculty self-managing organs deans of 12 faculties, but of the sample have been interrogated by the way of special questionnaire (Questionnaire II) the received data have been checked and supplemented by interview with a number of self-managing organ members at three faculties within the sample (Mining-Metallurgical Engineering Faculty in Zenica, Bio-Mechanical Engineering Faculty in Ljubljana, Higher School of Industrial Pedagogy in Rijeka).

Work content of the Faculty Council

The Faculty Councils of 11 faculties have met 83 times during 1970/71 school year (approximately 7,5 meeting for each council) and have discussed the following questions:

Discussed questions: 17)	How many times ?
the Year's work plan	14
the Financial plan	19
Establishing of the new faculty institution - new units	8
Curriculum and syllabus checkup	18
Questions concerning instruction	30

17) The term "discussed" means all the questions on which certain opinions or conclusions were made.

Discussed questions:	How many times?
Study and exams regulations	30
Analysis of teaching staff	20
Election and re-election of teaching staff	190
Income distribution	21
Financial conditions of students	19
Adoption of new normative acts and revision of the existing ones	34
Co-operation with the similar working organizations	26

As from the above data it can be seen, the dominant questions on the Faculty councils' meetings (in 1970/71 school year) were those on teaching staff election and re-election (44,2% of the total number of discussed questions). The second place took the questions on adoption or revision of normative acts (7,9%). Afterwards, with the similar percentage (6%) were the questions on instruction, study and exams regulations, as well as on co-operation with other work organizations. To a less extent (about 4,5%) questions on income distribution, analysis of teaching staff conditions, financing of the institution, and students' welfare were discussed. Discussion on an annual work plan and establishment of faculty institutions were only once on the council's agenda.

If election and re-election of teaching staff are considered to be the regular work, whose scope and frequence are depending on the number of present representatives and their election and re-election, then in the first place were questions on adoption and revision of normative acts, by which the work of the institution has been regulated. This is quite

understandable, because the Faculty Council, beingtthe highest self-managing organ, should establish all rights and regulations on the work of the institution.

According to the polled faculties initiative Councils' decisions was given by: departments, Faculty Teachers' Board Dean's Office, the Executive Board. Drafts of decisions were made by: temporary or permanent commissions, specially chosen groups, boards, faculty secretariats.

Before being presented to the Council drafts of decisions are discussed in commissions and on the Faculty teachers' Board, which submits their opinions, or proposals to the Faculty.Councils. On some faculties the proposals, drafts, decisions are firstly discussed by the Executive Board.

It should be mentioned that in preparations, preliminary discussions on proposals for greater number of faculty members take part than when the decision is made on the Council meeting.

Preliminary discussions have the aspiration to enable the participation of as great number of faculty members as possible.

Although the preliminary discussions on proposals in the scope of different meetings represent the form of democratic procedure, there are some opinions that things are done on the double track, because very often the same people listen to and give official statements on the same questions and in such a way spend a lot of their precious time (it happens that an individual is at the same time a member of the Faculty Council, Committee of the Year, sometimes a member of a commission).

In any case, to the Faculty Council draft decisions come on which the Faculty Teachers Board has previously declared.

When a proposal is in proceeding the Faculty Council gets acquainted with its explanation which is prepared by: either commissions or the Faculty Teachers` Board. Proposals are discussed and decided upon by the majority of votes of Council members. If proposals are well prepared (if they have good explanations), Council meetings are short. On the contrary, it happens that the Council postpones the discussion of a problem for its next meeting, insisting that more concrete explanations on the problem should be made.

On its decision (in some institutions they do it announcing before the meeting what is going to be on agenda), the Faculty Council gives information to the whole work organization or only to interested teaching units, professional services, executive organs (dean`s office, secretariat).

The decision is announced by the executive organ which is competent for it. In same cases executive organs are obliged, after definite time, to inform, on the meeting, the members of the Council that decision has been carried out. This procedure is quite understandable, as could be seen from some of the interviewed self-management participants who declared that in the work of their organs there were no problems on decision-making, but there were in its realisation, its carrying out; and they thought that some of its executors should feel more responsible for their being carried out.

According to the questionnaire and interview analysis approximately 1/3 up to 1/2 of participants take an active part on the Faculty Council meetings. One of the institutions declared that "more than a half", and the other "less than a quarter" take part in their work. As could be seen, the majority of those polled consider that 1/2 of Councils` present members take an active part in its work.

From the same polled material it can be concluded that on the question:"In which self-managing organ the active participation of the examinees take part" 3,20% of examinees consider it to be the Faculty Council. The Council is on the 4th place; behind the Committee of the Year (30,6%), the Faculty Teachers` Board (12,81%), commissions of those organs (10,63%). This happens because in self-managing organs` work, the great importance is paid to the preliminary phases (preliminary discussions) and to making of conceptions or decisions at the meetings of other self-management organs (not on the Council meetings), although the Council makes the final decision.

Character of the Faculty Council decisions

According to their character the Councils` decisions can be classified in several categories:

a) establishing, confirming of the decisions brought by self-managing organs having narrower competences "forwarding documents".

b) initial decision-making (in the first jurisdiction);

c) the final - "arbitrary" decision-making in the case of disagreement with other self-managing organs (commissions);

or final decision-making in connection with lodged complaints and submitted requests either by a self-managing organ or an individual (in such cases the Faculty Council consults and accepts proposals, explanations of the appropriate commissions).

In principle all decisions which have the character of a general act are firstly discussed at the meetings of the Faculty working community.

The Faculty Teachers' Board content of work

Frequency of topics dealt by this self-managing organ[18] was in 1970/71 school year as follows:

Discussed problems	How many times
-the Annual work plan	13
-the Financial	14
-Establishing of faculty institution-the new units	13
-the Curriculum and syllabi revision	34
-Instruction problems	78
-Study and exams requirements	54
-Applications for positions, election & reelection of teaching staff	185
-Analysis of teaching staff problems	34
-Income distribution	21
-Financial conditions of students	18
-Acceptance of new acts, revision of established normative acts	50
-Co-operation with different organizations	45
-Institution reform	8
-Research work program	1

18. The Faculty Teachers' Board of 11 faculties had during 1970/71 school year 105 meetings in total (on the average each faculty 9,5 meetings).

Here, as well as on the Faculty Council agenda on the first place are questions concerning election, re-election (32,5%). But, if these questions are concerned as constant (every day) (in the same way as it was done in the case of the Faculty Council - it can be seen that the Faculty Teachers' Board is the next one on which the instruction problems have been discussed (13,7%).

On the third place are the questions on study and exams requirements (9,5%). The remarkable place on the Faculty Teachers' Board work(similar to the Faculty Council work) take questions on acceptance of new acts and revision of the established normative acts (about 9%) which indicated that this organ also takes an active part in the establishment of the important regulations of the faculty work.

At the Faculty Teachers' Board meetings (105 in total) problems of co-operation with industry were discussed 45 times. Faculties do some research works for the needs of other work organizations,or they co-operate with them on some other basis. That is the reason of very frequent discussions on these problems on the Faculty Teachers' Board meetings (after all these subjects are often discussed on the Councils' meetings).

It can be noticed that within this self-managing organ work scientific-research work has been very rarely mentioned. The reason might be that in one time it was considered that intitutes, but not faculties, should carry it out, and that faculties' Concerne should be primerily instruction (at some institutes teaching staff were engaged and still are engaged in scientific research work as the external collaborators).

The Character of the Faculty Teachers' Board Decisions [19].

The first characteristic of this organ is that it "gives proposals". It gives proposals, for instance, for the curriculum and syllabi, for establishment of graduate level courses, for appointment of teaching staff, for general acts' establishment.

In some cases, Board doesn't make a decision if a competent commission has not previously made a proposal for solution of a problem. Commissions are required to submit detailed commentary on the problem in question. This makes the procedure of solution easier.

The Board also agrees on proposals made by some working organization (a department, a group, a stream or an individual). In most cases agreement must exist if a question is to be proceeded to the Council or to the Assembly for the final decision.

Finally, the Faculty Board makes some definite decisions. Their aim is to put into realization decisions already made by the Council or the Faculty Assembly (for instance those concerning organization of research work and instruction at the faculty and the like.

19. At some faculties it is called teaching-scientific board, or pedagogical-scientific board, or teachers' board, but considering its functions and competences it can be said that it is the similar organ which at different faculties has different names.

The Character of the Committee of the Year work

Committees of year have worked on the following problems during 1970/71 school year (number behind the subject denotes its frequency on agenda).[20]

Study requirements (5x), seminar & exams requirements (1x), instruction programing (1x), instruction development (1x), instruction realization (1x), field instruction (1x), practical students` work (1x), scientific group (1x), students`financial conditions (1x), students` representatives election into faculty organs (1x), text-books and mimeographed notes (1x).

Meetings of the year (all students in one year)[21]. The following questions were dealt with by that self-managing organ during 1970/71 school year: students` achievements, instruction problems, study requirements, exams` terms, text-books, mimeographed notes, students` election into Faculty self-managing organs, draft of the statute, students participation in self-management.

Activity of some participants` categories in self-management organs

Faculty estimations (out of the sample) on the work of some participants`categories are shown in the table. (Numbers in the table designate the number of the faculty which has chosen appropriate variety of answers), but of the offered

---

20. Committees of Year, this year have had 3 meetings on average.
21. Meetings of the year were held approximately twice a year.

kinds of possibilities those which are typical for the certain category of participatns have been marked by the faculties.

The way of demonstrating the activity	Category of participants			
	a) Teaching Staff	b) Students	c) Other person.	d) Social representat.
1.Only by attending meetings	-	1	4	1
2.By expressing opinion,attitude	8	7	3	7
3.By giving proposal	3	3	3	3
4.By explaining one`s views or by criticiz-ing	5	1	-	2
5.By objecting	5	3	2	1
6.By voting for the proposal	11	11	11	11
7.By beginning a dis-cussion on new questions	5	1	-	1

According to some results out of this table it can be concluded that 4 faculties consider that administrative and other personnel staff participation at self-management organs` meetings is manifested only in their meeting attendance.

All other categories of participants more or less equally take part in the work by saying their opinions, their

attitudes; the teaching staff being the most active in all activities.

It can be observed that social representatives take an active part in discussions by giving their opinions, proposals and developing new initiatives.

But, several polled faculties stated that the social representatives unregularly attend the meeting. Similar statement have been made by some polled members of self-managing organs, giving their explanations about this phenomenon. Namely, the high political and industry officials have been usually elected, have no time to attend faculty organs`meetings.

To the question: was the participation of the mentioned categories in self-managing organs on the whole satisfactory or unsatisfactory, the answers of the polled faculties were as follows:

Category of participants	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Teaching Staff	10	-
Students	6	4
Administrative and other personnel	5	5
Social and other representatives	7	4

Several faculties have given their opinion that participation of some participants` categories is unsatisfactory, they included all categories except teaching staff. The greatest criticism has been made against administrative personnel participation. In some polled persons` opinions this category has a "clerk like" attitude towards faculty organs`work

Opinions on students` participation in self-managing organs differ considerably. There were opinions that students are rather passive, being occupied with their studies, that their presence in the faculty is only temporary. There were other opinions that students` proposals were not often accepted and that it caused their passive attitude

The most important results of self-management according to the estimation of the polled faculties

Considering the previous information one can see that self-managing organ`s work content is rather heterogeneous. It was interesting to get the faculty opinions in which work area the important results have been achieved, results which could be considered as related to the development of new self-managing relations. The Deans` opinions are shown in the following table:

Type of results	Number of faculties
1. The organization of teaching staff has been improved	7
2. Integration of teaching and research work	1
3. Improvement of research work organization	2
4. Co-operation with industry and social services has been improved	4
5. Society influence was enlarged to the work of the faculty	3
6. Financial position of the faculty has been improved	6

7. Financial position of students has been improved	1
8. Teaching and other staff income have increased	1
9. Democratisation of inner faculty relations and its "opening" towards society	2
10. Greater interest of working community members	1
11. Greater activity of all categories of faculty employees	1

More concrete opinions on the results of self-management at the faculty have been got by the interview. So, for instance, it was heard that self-management had a positive influence on the democratization of relations between certain categories of participants (especially between teachers and students), that human relations have been better, that a sense of tolerance and atmosphere or co-operation existed.

In the same way the opinion has been obtained that self-manangement from year to year is getting more efficacuous (because work experiences are applied in the next period).

Estimating the general efficacy of the self-managing organs` work, the majority of polled faculties (7) gives a moderate opinion on it, that is, during 1969/70 and 1970/71 school year the self-managing organs have worked successfully.

The faculty organs` work, comparing with 1970/71, was estimated by three faculties as more "intensive and successful", while, one faculty considered that there were not data enough for the evaluation.

C h a p t e r V

C O N C L U S I O N S

Judging by the faculty statutes, chosen self-management organs and their various types, it can be concluded that self-management system at the higher education level has been accepted and carried out into life. Nevertheless, acceptance of self-managing principles, passing the regulations, election of self-management organs need not always guarantee self-management realization in accordance with its democratic and humanistic intention.

On the basis of the available documentation it could be said that in this area there are a considerable number of open questions. Somewhere the lack of experience is felt there is lack of insufficient knowledge of working people rights and duties, as well as competences of some of the organs. Self-management has been accepted, but the spirit of new relations has not been accepted, yet. If self-management, first of all, is understood as an affirmation process of more human relations, the acceptance of these relations then can be measured only by estimation of legal rights. Everything can't be predicted by law, very often one finds gaps which can be solved in different ways. Although such solutions are not illegal they might be opposed to the self-management intentions, because they spoil human relations which are presupposed by it. That is the reason why self-management should be accepted by working people at higher education level,

primarily as a process of relations` democratization and the process of greater responsibility to the social community. But at the same time one should point out the community obligations in setting conditions for realization of self-management in higher education. Self-management at higher education can`t get its affirmation without realization of social obligations towards faculties. For instance, the proclaimed principle of "rewards according to the work" can`t be realized as long as an institution income rate is not dependant on the social worth of its work. The one who grants financial means, is in fact, the one who determines on limits and possibilities of self-management. So, to a great extent, it depends on criteria of grant allotment for instruction and research work. If those resources are below the social minimum, the self-management can become the cause of bad human relations.

As it is seen, self-management at higher education level is a task which still should be better studied.

On the basis of what was said in chapters III and IV the following can be stated:

One of the fundamental tendencies of self-managing system development at university is the constant affirmation of faculties as essential and authonomous work organizations which are united into the university. In that way the university becomes the higher form of unity of authonomous, self-managing faculties. This high form is, as a rule, organized on the principle representation of all structures.

The organization forms in which teachers, collaborators, students and other working at the faculty realize their self-management rights have been developed as results of specific instruction and research process at the faculties. From them diversity of organization of self-managing relations derives diversity in types, structures and competences of self-managing organs. Nearly every faculty has, besides the common, some specific self-managing characteristics.

At some faculties - Assemblies - as the highest and broadest organs of faculty management have been established. In them all structures - teachers and their collaborators, students and administrative personnel are included.

Committees of the year are getting greater and greater importance in self-management system, representing the essential direct form of mutual teachers` and students` self-management. Committees of the Year are expected to introduce the new and more modern methods of instruction, especially intensive forms of instruction (discussion groups, seminars and study groups) having for their aim to enable students for the individual work and scientific treatment of problems.

As one of the characteristics of self-managing organs the stronger participation of not-teaching personnel has been remarked. This category has been given more important place in the self-management relations reform than it had had ever before; this has been done in accordance with the role this category plays at the university.

The orientation to a greater faculty independence and self-management has been manifested in the smaller number of social representatives in their management organs. This obviously shows that faculties - as well as authonomous organizations in other social services - are in position to coordinate authonomously their interests with general social needs and interests.

When self-management is organized at the university, the following matter has to be taken into account: the nature of scientific work requires forming of the university self-management organs which should deal with the most important problems of scientific research work organization at faculties. However, besides scientific, the faculty work includes educational tasks which have to be solved every day on the department, group and faculty level. Therefore, on the faculty level such self-management form which will simultaniously accomplish both the faculty tasks and aims (the tasks of departments, groups and years)and the university tasks and aims (the highest scientific aims) has been required.

The position of a student as a subject of instruction and self-management has been more discussed and certain measures have been taken in this direction. By new laws on higher education in the Republics the student`s position has been considerably changed.

The following changes are characteristic for this position: students` introduction into organs in which they were not represented before, forming of new organs (gathering of students and teachers) and forms of direct self-management and democratization (demands for direct election of university and faculty deans) and especially changes in students` position

in the work and instruction process, in which students should be the real self-management subjects.

However, relatively little has been accomplished in the latter, because the instruction conception, its content and methods have not been more fundamentaly changed, but all this is the greatest obstacle to make the students more active.

There are some attempts to treat the students as working people who, at the present, find themselves in relations which have been developing on the basis of new loans and stipend forms, or more exactly, on the basis of relations between bigger industry organizations, faculties and students. Special level of self-managing rights the students should reach by their status of the equal membership of the faculty working community.

The question of human relations at the higher education institutions has been the current one. Some people consider it difficult, because the hierarchic relations still exist at the faculty. The others say that those relations are based on dquality principles and that there are no privileged groups or classes.

In reality, both hierarchic and real human relations exist side by side, depending on people and condition on some faculties. Investigations have proved that in the majority of cases - students, teaching staff, their collaborators don't feel quite on equal terms. There might be a subjective component in it, but research results point out towards the need of greater understanding, cooperation and respect.

In short, results at up-to-now self-management development have been the following ones:

1. The whole conception of self-management at faculties and the university has been made, and the system of self-management has been at all faculties, more or less realized.

2. The university and faculty position in self-management has been regulated in such a way that faculties have been proclaimed authonomous work organizations and the university has been established only as self-managing organization, that is, as an association of authonomous faculties. In that way, in their self-managing rights, faculties have been equalized with self-managing organization in industry and social management has been changed by self-management.

3. Self-managing organs have been formed at all universities and faculties; the scope of their work, rights and duties of their members and the new relations between faculty and university self-managing organs have been established by their statutes.

4. The former administrative relations between universities and government organs have been changed by relations between the university self-managing organs and authority organs and their executive organs, as well as by the community of interests' organs.

5. The former budget financing has been changed by the new form of financing - coming out of financing communities. Although these communities have rather strong influence on the work of faculties, still these relations have a stamp of self-managing regulation even in the financial area.

6. Position and status of some participants' categories have been changed or are undergoing a change:

a) a number of students participating in self-management has increased; Students are getting equal in rights with other participants; an idea, about a student as an instruction process subject and a carrier of means for education has been gradually built; students are beginning to be chosen even on the leading positions (vice deans and vice rectors);

b) the intentions to improve the position of assistant teaching staff are obvious (especially the position of assistants), as well as of other administrative personnel, - this especially in solving questions of their capability for self-management.

c) parallel with the faculty stronger self-managing position the role and participation of social representatives in faculty and university councils is getting reduced.

7. Some forms of direct self-management and direct democratization have been introduced: gathering of students and teachers the referendum and assembly in which all three structures of participants have been equally represented.

8. The former hierarchic relations within the faculties and between the faculties and the university are being replaced by new human relations, which have been characterized by the self-managing, co-operative relation, relation of solidarity.

9. Procedures and processes of preparing, of making and putting self-managing decisions into effect have been established; the necessary normative acts, which have to enable more efficacious functioning of self-managing organs have been passed.

10. The self-managing system with more or less difficulties, in general has been put into effect, and it has been functioning more or less efficaciously depending on the type of the faculty and relations on it (the new or the old type of the faculty, smaller or bigger in size, homogeneous or heterogenous one).

In order to have self-management relations at faculties and universities developed in future in the same direction it is necessary:

- that all working people at the faculty - teachers, researchers, students and administrative personnel - become the authonomous self-management performers. All categories should be represented on the parity principle;

- that Committees of the Year and Assemblies become the permanent forms of direct self-management; and in such organization the Assembly should have the capacity of planning development at faculty policy on the whole (beside its right to discuss on the vice dean and vice rector election);

- that in the Faculty Council should be elected only those representatives of social and industry organizations and organs who are directly interested for the definite

scientific fields, and who, therefore will be able and are able effectively to answer the questions of the general faculty policy;

- that the basic working organizations (departments, institutes, centers etc) more nnd more take over initiative and responsibility for scientific and educational activities as well as for solution of other problems (financial,personnel, etc.);

- that the university gets more known as an volontery association of self-managing faculties, in which the problems of mutual interests are solved, as well as those questions for whose solution the faculty gives special permits to the university;

- that more attention should be paid to strengthening and development of direct forms of self-management, and the work of organs of indirect self-management should become public and accessible to all faculty members;

- that relations of broader co-operation and understanding should be developed; that all opinions and proposals should be respected, if they are good and useful, regardless who makes them, that the work should be undertaken to eliminate groups` or individuals` obstinacy, which is one of the important task, as well.

SAPPLEMENTARY

AND APPENDIX MATERIAL S

A. Bibliography

- Dr Jovan Djordjević: Plaidoyer for a New Modern University, "Politika", 20-26 July, 1969.

- Marijan Filipović: Higher Education in Yugoslavia, Belgrade, 1971.

- Tavčar: Self-management in social services Work organization, Belgrade, November, 1970, pp.16-19.

- Pečujlić, M: Future which has begun, Reflector, Belgrade, 29,30-VI, 1969.

- Kardelj, E: On War, Piece, Leninizm and Self-management. An Interview to the Journal: "Die Neue Gdsellschaft", Reflektor, Belgrade, 10-I-1970.

- Constitution of the Federative Republic of Yugoslavia (published in "Službeni list SFRJ", No.14/63).

- Basic Law on Establishments ("Službeni list SFRJ", No.5/65).

- General Law on Education ("Službeni list SFRJ", No.4/64 and 1/67).

- Yugoslav Yearbook of Statistics, 1954-1970, Federal Institute for Statistics, Beograd, 1954-1970.

B. Glossary

1) ASSOCIATED LABOR represents the work of workers who associate in a direct way and on a voluntary basis into basic units of associated labor and other forms of associated labor and manage independently their activities, products of their work and their income, all on the basis of the public property of the production means. The labor of these workers is free from all elements of hired labor and exploatation.

2) BASIC UNIT OF ASSOCIATED LABOR. [illegible] This is a basic form of associated labor in which workers have the oportunity to settle their inter-relations at work in a direct way, to manage their activities and the means of social reproduction, to make decisions about their income and other problems regarding their socio-economic position, all on the basis of their work and their self-managing rights.

3) COMMUNITY OF EDUCATION is an independent self-managing organization having all the legal rights in decision-making, founded in order that the realization of the highest possible level of the social role of education could be achieved. This organization is a direct link between the educational institutions and economy and social services; it has the right to decide about the distribution of social ressources for education. It consists of educational institutions, work organizations in economy and social services and other interested organizations and citizens.

4) COMMUNITY OF INTEREST is an agreement made between work organizations and institutions which may belong to the same field or to different fields, but having mutual interest in solving one or more problems.

5) DEETATIZATION is a process of transmission of competences and activities from state bodies to the self-managing social bodies and institutions.

6) FUND FOR EDUCATION consists of ressources from permanent and obligatory sources and various other sources aimed for financing and the development of the material basis of schools and other educational institutions. The permanent and obligatory sources for financing of education are the following: contribution from the personal income of employees, a part of communal and republican taxes to turnover of retail trade and services, addional sources from income of socio-political communities and other sources. There are also other kinds of sources: those given by work organizations, voluntary contributions of citizens, gifts and donations, means earned from activities of educational institutions.

7) INCOME-BASED RELATIONS. It is a specific kind of relation in production based in the fact that not only between completely independent organizations, but also between economic units inside these organizations, the settlement of contribution value in common work, and accordingly the distribution of income of the organization is carried out either on the principles of the services and products prices on the market or according to agreed prices of services and products.

8) SELF-MANAGEMENT is a principle of institution management carried out by workers who are employed in it and who manage directly or through the self-managing bodies which they have elected. According to this system, persons who are not members of the working community can take part in management only in institutions which have a function of particular social interest.

9) SOCIAL MANAGEMENT is a system according to which an institution is managed, besides the members of its working community, also by other citizens as representatives of society or interested economic, socio-political and other social organizations.

10) SOCIAL SERVICES. In the Constitution of Yugoslavia from 1963, fields as education, culture, health and the like are referred to as public services. Work organizations in the field of higher education represent a very important part of social services. They are the highest institutions for education and research work.

11) SOCIO-POLITICAL COMMUNITY is a general term designating community, republic, autonomous province or federation. These communities are socio-economic collectives having common links and interests which are settled in a democratic system of autority and self-management.

12) STREAMED EDUCATION. This term is used in the works of some experts in order to define the whole education acquired after the completion or education in the elementary school. It means that the post-primary education is streamed in accordance with the needs of economy and social services, as well according to individual interests. According to the Law on Financing of Education of SR Croatia there are various forms of streamed education at the secondary and higher education level.

13) SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS in YUGOSLAVIA consists of faculties, higher schools of university level, art academies and higher schools. In spite of the fact that higher schools are included into higher education institutions, there are considerable differencies between these schools and faculties, art academies and higher schools of university level. Namely, the instruction on faculties, art academies and higher schools of university level may consist of three independent and yet inter-connected levels. Scientific work is organized on all faculties, while on art academies only in case they are entitled to it. In higher schools' studies are not devided into levels and there is no research work.

Although universities are not part of the category of higher education institutions, according to some republican laws on education they have got the oportunity to carry out duties of institutions of higher education.

14) SYSTEM OF INCOME is a kind of distribution (appearing after 1961); working people earn their income by associated labor on social ressources and dispose of it, this income being the result of their work and the social work, in a self-managing way.

15) WORK ORGANIZATION. It is an organization founded with the aim to satisfy certain needs of society and its citizens, and it is formed on the basis of free associated labor. There are two main categories of work organizations: 1) enterprises, 2) institutions in the field of education (schools, faculties), health (hospitals) and other social services.

OE 6000(Rev.9-66) Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

(TOP) ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC Accession No.	Clearinghouse Accession Number	Résumé Date	Is Document Copyrighted? NO
001	No.	20.VI-1972	ERIC Reproduction Release? YES

100 T i t l e: Organization, Function and Results of Social Self-management at the Institution of Higher Education and their Associations.

101
102
103 Final Report

Personal Author(s)

200 Vrcković Dragutin, Dr and "others"

Institution (Source) | Source Code

300 Yugoslav Institute for Educational Research Belgrade - Yugoslavia

310 Report/Series No. A - 1 /1969.

320 Other Source -- | Source Code

330 Other Report No. ---

340 Other Source ---

350 Other Report No. ---

400 Publ. Date: 20-VI-1972 Contract/Grant Number: OEG-9-001000-827

Pagination, etc.
500 113 pp.
501

Retrieval Terms

600
601
602
603
604
605
606

Identifiers

607

800 A B S T R A C T

This Final Report on the research results has 5 parts.
In the first part (the introduction) socio-economic and political changes causing social management and self-management at the higher education have been analysed; a short survey of self-management at
801
802
803
804
805
806

Abstract

at the Yugoslav universities has been presented; the problem, aim and subject of research have been defined.

In the second part (Methods and Procedures) the plan of the research has been shown, sample choice and analysis method have been explained.

The method of investigation of opinions and attitudes of about 2.000 teachers, students and administrative staff on the sample of 12 faculties has been presented.

In the third part (Results) the structure and degree of self-managing organs development have been analysed; financial resources of the existing self-management structure have been discussed; the new way of free faculty and community uniting has been analysed.

In the fourth part some basic research results in the area of self-managing organs between the university and faculties have been in more details analysed; the relations of the university self-managing organs and authority organs, as well as relations between the university self-managing organs and society as a whole, have also been analysed. At the end of this part functioning of self-managing organs on the basis of data given in the third and fourth part, some conclusions and statements in the fifth part, have been presented (conclusions).

This part deals with matters which have, or have not been achieved in the up-to-the present work and some problems and possibilities of the further development have been indicated.

YUGOSLAV INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

Q U E S T I O N N A I R E

ON SELF-MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTES

Instruction: Answers are given by rounding up the letter in front of the chosen answer

B E L G R A D E

June 1970

YUCOSLAV INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
No.05 - 1439/1
Belgrade, 17. IX 1970.

Dear Madam, Sir,

We kindly ask for your co-operation in research work on organization, function and recent results of self-management at your Faculty - High School.

The enclosed questionnaire requires the right answer to be chosen among different possible answers. Only in two cases it is expected to get yours opinions, that is your proposals, in written form.

The filled questionnaire should be returned to the sender.

We thank you for your co-operation.

D I R E C T O R
Dr Dragutin Franković

I GENERAL DATA ON EXAMINEE

1. Pole	a. Male b) Female
2. Age	a. from 19-30 years of age b. from 31-40 " " c. from 41-50 " " d. from 51-60 " " e. from 61 on
3. Category of Examinee: Teaching Staff	a. Full Professor b. Associate Professor c. Assistant Professor d. Lecturer e. Assistant f. Lecturer g. Other co-operator in instruction
Students:	a. Freshman b) Second year Student c. Third year Student d. Fourth year Student e. Fifth year Student
Administration & technical Staff:	a.Librarians b. Administration Staff c. Technical Staff d. Other kinds of Assisting staff

II EXAMINEES' OPINION ON SELF-MANAGEMENT

1. It is pre-supposed in self-management that every good idea and initiative should be accepted regardless the position of a person who pleads for it. Has such an idea of direct democracy been accepted in your institution?

A/Yes B/ No C/ It has still to be work on it

2. Management of working people in higher education can be organized as self-management in which only working people from the respective institution take part, as well as social management in which beside them the representatives of society as auter members take part. Which of these forms should have priority considering the character of the self-management in higher education ?

a) Self-management
b. Social management.

3. There are direct forms of self-management in-them all the members of the institution take part, and there are representative forms of self-management in which only chosen members take part. Which of these forms should have priority?

a) Direct forms
b. Representative forms

4. In which self-managing organ at your Faculty the most important decission concerning life and work of the whole institution have been made?

a) At the Annual Assembly of the Institution
b. At the meeting of the Working Community
c. At the Faculty Board
d. At the Executive Board
e. At the Faculty Teachers` Board
f. At the Year Boards (of departments etc).
g. .....

5. Do you consider, on the basis of your experience, that the Faculty (School) Assembly is important in the self-management of the Faculty (School):

a. Is very important
b) Is very important within other organs
c. Is almost unimportant
d. I don`t know whether it has any importance.

6. Did you take part at the Meeting of the Working Community during the last 1969/70 school-year ?

a. Yes
b) No
c. Partially

7. Were you or are you now the member of some of mentioned self-management organs ?

a. of the Faculty Board
b. of the Faculty Council
c. of the Executive Board
d. of the Year Board
e. .....

8. If you take an active part in the work of some of commission of Self - management organs write the names of the commissions?

.....
.....
.....

9. In discussions on improvement of self-management system it has been said that students should be the members of the Faculty working community. Do you think they should ?

a) Yes
b. No

10. If you think students should be members of Faculty working community,say with what kinds of rights :

a. Should have right to decide about all questions
b) Should have right to decide about all questions except about personal income
c. Should have right to decide about their studies and exclusively on students` problems
d. Could give only proposals
e. .....

3.

11. If your answer to the question No.9 was that students should be the members of the Faculty working community should those be:

a. All students without exception (including part time students)
b. All full time students
c. Only students from the second year on
d. Only students who pass their exam regularly
e. Only students representatives
f. .....

12. Open, but principal participation in my institution has as its consequence:

a) Acceptance of proposals
b. Not reacting
c. Rejecting of proposals
d. Negative consequences

13. In which self-managing organ your real participation is shown

a. In the Year Board
b. In the Faculty Board
c. In the Executive Board
d. In the Faculty Council
e. In the commissions of the organs
f. .....

14. If you have answered the previous answer (No.13) mark the most aften ways of your participation:

a. I take part in discussion when I think it can be useful
b. I discuss very often and make proposals
c. If needed, I discuss several times and I fight for my (or somebody else`s) good proposal
d. I insist on decissions to be fulfilled

4.

15. Did your proposal have most often influence on decission made by self-managing organs?

a. They did
b. I think they did
c. They didn`t

16. If your discussions and proposals had no influence on the made decissions, could it be because of some of following reasons:

a. I wasn`t persuasive enough
b. I didn`t insist much
c. Usually opinions and proposals of one group are accepted
d. Discussions and proposals at the meetings are only formality because decission have been made in advance

17. Are you satisfied with your participation in self-managing organs?

a. I am very satisfied
b. I am satisfied
c. I am partially satisfied
d. I am not satisfied

18. Much is said about Year Boards as well as about the basic sells of self-managing system. What statute they have at your Faculty--school?

a) Year Board are anticipated and they make decissions on all questions of instruction organization, of work and relationships
b. They exist in statute but their influence is not felt
c. They exist but nobody carries out their decissions yet
d. In practice they function as the basic sell of self-managing system although it has not been regulated by the statute yet.

5.

19. Self-management development at the institutions of higher education is in close connection with the functioning of income system and by the sharing of the income according to the work performed. Has the principle of self-management at your Faculty been realized from this point of view?

a. It has been realized
b. It has not been realized
c) It has been realized only partially.

20. Besides economic the self-management principle has broader social and ethical meaning - abolishing bureaucratic and establishing the true human relationships. Has the principle of self-management at your Faculty been realized from this point of view?

a. It has been realized
b. It has not been realized
c) It has been realized only partially.

21. Are you satisfied with your position of participator in self-management in your Institution?

a. I am satisfied
b. I am not satisfied
c. I am only partially satisfied.

22. Taking into account the specific character of self-management at higher education should self-management participators take decissions

a. All on all questions
b. All on basic (common) questions
c. Each participator category only on its own narrower professional questions
d) Some categories should decide only on questions which are concerning them.

6.

23. Which self-management organs have the greatest influence on instruction improvement? Cite them in the order of their influence

.....

.....

24. Which problems were in the domain of work of self-management organ at your Faculty? (You could give more than one question)

a) Curriculum & syllabi problems
b. Instruction development
c. Development of pedagogical organization of instruction
d. Development of research work at the Faculty
e. Faculty financing problems
f. Organization problems
g. Problems of Income and its sharing
h. Human relationship problems
i. .....

25. In which fields the important results have been realized by using self-management system at your Faculty? (You could give more than one answer)

a. Better financing of the Faculty
b. Improvement of instruction has been fulfilled
c. Increase of incomes
d. Curricula and syllabi have been improved
e. Pedagogical organization of instruction has been improved
f. Improvement of research work
g. .....
h. .....
i. .....

7.

26. Relationship between teachers and students at the Faculty are

a. Absolutely satisfying
b. Only partially satisfying
c. Not satisfying

27. What influence have socio-political organizations (the League of Youth, League of Communists, Trade Union) on self-management at your Faculty?

a. Very important
b. Important influence
c. Relatively weak
d. No influence at all

28. From your point of view which are obstacles to the self-management development at your Faculty?

29. What you think it should be done to improve, develop and affirm self-management at your Faculty?

8.

IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO SIGN

Structure of the examined groups sample at "faculties" in 1970/71 school year in realization of the Study Project: Organization[1]*Function and Results of Social Self-Management at the Institutions of Higher Education and Their Associations

Category: 1. Teaching Staff	Total	Category: 2. Tudents	Total	Category: 3. Administration Staff	Total
Professors Associate	155	I II year Students	333	Librarians administrahón staff	119
Docents Lecturer	172	III year Students	433	Technical staff	65
Assistants	240	IV V year Students	308	Cleaning Staff	41
Assistant-teachers	94	Unknown year of Study	4	Unknown type of job	4
Total	661	Total	1084	Total	229

Examined in Total: 1974

* The following Faculties have been examined:

1. Bio-technical - Ljubljana
2. Electro-technical - Zagreb
3. F.of Philosophy - Beograd
4. F.of Philosophy - Sarajevo
5. F. of Philosophy - Zadar
6. F. of Mechanical Engineering - Kragujevac
7. F.of Medicine - Beograd
8. F.of Metallurgy - Skopje
9. F. of Metallurgy - Zenica
10. F. of Law - Split
11. F. of Forestry - Beograd
12. The Higher School for Industrial - Pedagogy - Rijeka

1. Faculty here means University Department

T a b l e No.1

1. Examinees' opinions on the direct democracy idea acceptance at the faculties

Category of examinees	Totally examined	A. is accepted and esteemed		B. is not accepted		C. It needs to be worked on		D. Without answer	
Teaching staff	661	229	34,64	51	7,71	328	49,62	53	8,03
Students	1084	291	26,84	127	11,71	624	57,56	42	3,89
Administration staff	229	58	25,33	42	18,34	108	47,16	21	9,17
T o t a l	1974	578	29,28	220	11,12	1060	53,69	116	5,91

T a b l e No.2

2. Examinees' opinions on the type of management which should be given priority

Category of examinees	Totally examined	a. Self-management		b. Social management		c. Without answer	
Teaching staff	661	408	61,72	202	30,57	51	7,71
Students	1084	762	70,30	281	25,93	41	3,77
Administration staff	229	130	56,65	68	29,65	31	13,70
T o t a l	1974	1300	65,85	551	27,91	123	6,24

T a b l e No.3

3. Examinees' opinions on the kinds of self-management which should be given priority at faculties

Category of examinees	Totally examined	a. Indirect types of self-management		b. Direct types of self-management		C. Without answer	
Teaching staff:							
Full and Associate Professors	155	76		71		8	
Assistant, Professors Lecturer	172	89		71		12	
Assistants	240	147		79		14	
Other teaching staff	94	58		26		10	
T o t a l	661	370	56,00	247	37,34	44	6,66
Students:							
I & II year Students	339	269		52		18	
III year Students	433	319		101		13	
IV & V year Students	308	235		63		10	
Unknown year of Studies	4	2		0		2	
T o t a l	1084	825	76,1o	216	19,94	43	3,96
Administration Staff :							
Librarians & Administration	119	66		44		9	
Technical Staff	65	38		14		13	
Assistants of different kinds	41	19		12		10	
unknown	4	4		0		0	
T o t a l	229	127	55,45	70	30,55	32	14,00
GRAND TOTAL	1974	1322	66,96	533	26,96	119	6,08

Table No4

4. Examinees' opinions concerning the kind of the faculty self-managing organ in which the most important decisions take place

Category of Examinees	Total of examined	a. At the annual Assembly	b. At the meeting of the Faculty Board	c. At the faculty council	d. At the managing Board	e. At the Council of Professors	f. At the Students' Councils (groups)	g. At some other organ	h. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	17 2,58	102 15,43	166 25,11	45 6,8o	288 43,57	5 0,76	38 5,75	48 7,26
Students	1084	226 20,84	42 3,88	260 24,oo	25 2,3o	190 17,53	144 13,28	30 2,8o	167 15,41
Administration	229	8 3,48	36 15,7o	96 41,9o	20 8,72	41 17,91	5 2,19	9, 4,oo	25 10,9o
Total	1974	251 12,71	180 9,12	522 26,44	90 4,56	519 26,29	154 7,8o	77 3,9o	240 12,15

T a b l e No.5

5. Examinees' opinions on the question whether the Faculty Assembly is important in the sdf- management system at the Faculty

Category of Examinees	Total of examined	a. Has a great importance	b. Is important within other organs	c. Almost no importance	d. They don't know whether it has any importance	e. Without answers
Teaching Staff	661	61 9,23	257 32,88	151 22,84	162 24,51	30 4,54
Students	1084	217 20,01	410 37,91	92 8,48	312 28,78	53 4,82
Administration	229	33 14,41	66 23,90	33 14,41	72 31,40	25 10,88
T o t a l	1974	311 15,75	733 37,18	276 13,95	546 27,66	108 5,48

T a b l e No.6

6. Examinees took part in 1969/70 school year in the work of the Council of all Faculty members

Category of examinees	Total of examined	a. Yes	b. No	c. Partly	d. Without Answer
Teaching Staff	661	374 56,59	118 17,85	142 21,48	27 4,08
Students	1084	130 12,00	731 67,43	191 17,62	32 2,95
Administration	229	88 38,42	85 37,11	43 18,80	13 5,67
T o t a l	1974	592 29,99	934 47,32	376 19,05	72 3,64

Table No.7

7. Examinees have been or are now the members of some self-managing organ at the Faculty

Category of Examinees	Total Examined	a. Faculty Council		b. The Faculty Teachers Board		c. Executive Board		d. Year Council		e. Some other organ		f. They are not without Answer	
Teaching Staff	661	171	25,87	357	54,02	74	11,20	215	32,52	28	4,23	152	23,00
Students	1084	25	2,30	15	1,38	13	1,20	125	11,53	91	8,40	815	75,18
Administration	229	35	15,28	24	10,46	12	5,23	12	5,23	17	7,42	135	58,95
Total	1974	231	11,70	396	20,06	99	5,01	352	17,83	136	6,89	1102	55,82

T a b l e No.8

8. Examinees actively take part in self-management organs

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. Instruction Board	b. Cadre problems Board	c. Research Board	d. Student Standard Board	e. Financing Board	f. Culture & Sport Board	g-h. Other Boards	x. Neigher without answer
Teaching Staff	661	55 8,32	31 4,7o	32 4,84	11 1,66	17 2,56	2 0,3o	110 16,64	431 65,2o
Students	1084	4 0,37	0	0	0	1 0,13	2 0,26	13 1,2o	1064 98,15
Administration	229	2 0,87	3 1,31	0	0	5 2,18	0	23 10,o4	197 86,oo
Total	1974	61 3,o9	34 1,72	32 1,62	11 0,55	23 1,16	4 0,2o	146 7,39	1692 85,76

T a b l e No.9

9. Examinees' opinions whether students should be members of the Faculty of Board

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. Yes		b. No		c. Without answers	
Teaching Staff	661	523	79,12	126	19,07	12	1,81
Students	1084	1013	93,45	45	4,15	26	2,40
Administration	229	153	66,81	61	26,64	15	6,55
T o t a l	1974	1689	85,55	232	11,80	53	2,65

Table No.10

10. Examinees consider students should be the members of the Faculty Board having the following rights

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. Having the right to decide about all matters	b. On all, except on income	c. Only on students' problems	d. With possibility only to give proposals	e. Other kinds of answers	f. Shouldn't be the members of Faculty Board; Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	57 8,62	72 10,88	321 48,44	86 13,00	11 1,66	114 17,40
Students	1084	296 27,30	249 23,00	444 40,95	43 3,96	4 0,36	48 4,43
Administration	229	15 6,55	25 10,90	94 41,05	34 14,90	2 0,85	59 25,75
Total	1974	368 18,64	346 17,52	859 43,51	163 8,25	17 0,86	221 11,22

T a b l e No.11

11. Which students should be the members of Faculty Board?
Opinions of the Examinees

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. All Students	b. All fulltime Students	c. Since the Second year of Studies	d. Those who pass their exams regularly	e. Only Students Representatives	f. Other	g. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	39 5,90	65 9,83	35 5,30	160 24,05	220 33,28	9 1,36	133 20,28
Students	1084	184 16,97	288 26,57	126 11,62	139 12,82	281 25,92	17 1,56	49 4,54
Administration	229	7 3,05	18 7,86	6 2,62	48 20,96	74 32,32	3 1,31	73 31,88
Total	1974	230 11,65	371 18,79	167 8,45	347 17,58	575 29,12	29 1,50	255 12,91

T a b l e No.12

12. Examinees' opinions on consequences of free and open discussion at the meetings of self-management organs

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. Acceptance of Proposals		b. Indiference		c. Rejection of Proposals		d. Negative Consequences		e. Something else		f. Without answer	
Teaching Staff	661	375	56,72	111	16,78	29	4,38	46	7,00	3	0,45	97	14,67
Students	1084	487	44,92	277	25,55	59	5,44	107	9,87	10	0,92	144	13,30
Administration	229	75	32,75	49	21,44	10	4,36	42	18,34	0	0,00	53	23,11
Total	1974	937	47,46	407	20,62	98	4,96	195	9,88	13	0,65	294	14,89

T a b l e No.13

13. In which self-managing organ the real participation of examinees takes place their opinion

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. In the Year Council		b. In the Faculty Council		c. In the Executive Board		d. In the Faculty council		e. In the Commissions of these organs		f. In other organs		g. Without answers	
Teaching Staff	661	154	23,3o	183	27,7o	32	4,84	110	16,64	151	22,86	31	4,68	129	19,51
Students	1084	437	40,31	45	4,15	10	0,92	26	2,39	29	2,67	38	3,5o	499	46,o3
Administration	229	14	6,11	25	10,91	12	5,24	26	11,34	30	13,1o	25	10,91	114	50,oo
Total	1974	605	30,64	253	12,81	54	2,73	162	8,2o	210	10,63	94	4,76	742	37,53

Table No.14

14. Examinees' answers concerning the most often way of their participation in self- management

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. Discusses when considers it to be worth	b. Often discusses and gives proposals	c. If needed discusses several times and fights for good proposals	d. Insists the good conclusions to be realized	e. Something else	f. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	375 56,73	36 5,44	65 9,83	108 16,33	0 0,00	144 21,78
Students	1084	364 33,58	42 3,87	94 8,67	112 10,33	3 0,27	469 43,26
Administration	229	57 24,90	6 2,62	12 5,24	29 12,66	0 0,00	129 56,33
Total	1974	796 40,32	84 4,25	171 8,66	249 12,61	3 0,15	742 37,58

T a b l e No.15

15. Had proposals of the examinees any influence on the decissions of self-management organs?

Category of examinees	Totally examined	a. they had		b. they believe they had		c. they hadn't		f. without answer	
Teaching Staff	661	71	10,74	340	51,44	115	17,4o	135	20,42
Students	1084	62	5,71	335	30,9o	322	29,7o	365	33,69
Administration	229	13	5,76	49	21,4o	72	31,44	95	41,4o
T o t a l	1974	146	7,4o	724	36,67	509	25,78	595	30,15

T a b l e No.16

16. Examinees' opinions on reasons causing their proposals to be uninfluential on self-management organs decissions

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. It wasn't persuasive enough	b. He didn't insist enough	c. The proposals of a particular group are accepted	d. Decissions have been prepared in advance	e. Some other opinions	f. They had influence; without answer
Teaching Staff	661	65 9,91	120 18,15	118 17,85	83 12,55	4 0,oo	271 41,oo
Students	1084	69 6,36	148 13,65	191 17,6o	191 17,6o	0 0,o	485 44,79
Administration	229	9 3,93	11 4,8o	36 15,72	58 25,33	0	115 50,22
Total	1974	143 7,24	279 14,13	345 17,48	332 16,82	4 0,2o	871 44,13

T a b l e No.17

17. Examinees answers to the question whether they are satisfied being in self-management organs

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. They are very satisfied		b. Satisfied		c. Partly satisfied		d. Not satisfied		e. Without answer	
Teaching Staff	661	16	2,42	203	30,71	242	36,61	112	16,95	88	13,31
Students	1084	28	2,58	99	9,13	327	30,16	341	31,46	289	26,67
Administration	229	4	1,74	34	14,84	55	24,02	60	26,20	76	33,20
Total	1974	48	2,43	336	17,02	624	31,61	513	26,00	453	22,94

Table No.18

18. Examinees' opinions on the Year Council Status in the self-management system at the Faculty

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. Anticipated by Statute take decissions on all questions concerning work and relationship	b. Anticipated by Statute they don't work in reality	c. They exist but decissions are not taken into account	d. They are not anticipated by Statute but function as a basic sell of self-management	e. Some other kinds of opinions	f. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	196 29,66	295 44,63	56 8,47	32 4,84	0 0,0	82 12,40
Students	1084	282 26,01	446 41,14	137 12,63	37 3,41	3 0,30	179 16,51
Administration	229	47 20,52	59 26,00	14 6,11	13 5,78	2 0,87	94 40,72
Total	1974	525 26,59	800 40,52	207 10,48	82 4,15	5 0,25	355 18,01

T a b l e No.19

19. Examinees' opinions whether division of income has been devided according to the work results

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. It has been realized	b. It has not been realized	c. Only partly realized	d. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	176 26,63	131 19,81	304 45,99	50 7,57
Students	1084	212 19,55	97 8,95	420 38,74	355 32,76
Administration	229	43 18,8o	54 23,6o	101 44,1o	31 13,5o
Total	1974	431 21,8o	282 14,4o	825 41,7o	436 22,1o

T a b l e 20

20. Examinees' opinions whether abolition of bureaucratic relations and establishment of democratic human relations have been realized by means of self-management

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. It has been realized		b. Not realized		c. Only partly		d. Without answer	
Teaching Staff	661	247	37,36	60	9,08	319	48,26	35	5,30
Students	1084	300	27,67	122	11,25	539	49,72	123	11,36
Administration	229	63	27,51	40	17,46	100	43,66	26	11,37
T o t a l	1974	610	30,95	222	11,23	958	48,52	184	9,30

T a b l e No.21

21. Examinees' answer to the question whether they are satisfied with the possibility of taking part in self-management at the Faculty

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. Satisfied		o. Not satisfied		c. Partly satisfied		d. Without answer	
Teaching Staff	661	306	46,3o	65	9,83	255	38,57	35	5,3o
Students	1084	168	15,5	269	24,8	504	46,5	143	13,2
Administration	229	46	20,1	75	32,8	81	35,3	27	11,8
Total	1974	520	26,4	409	20,6	840	42,6	205	10,4

T a b l e No.22

22. Examinees' opinion on their participation scope in faculty self-management

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. All on all essential questions	b. All on essential general questions	c.-d. Each category on its own questions	e. Answer of different kind	f. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	56 8,47	317 47,96	263 39,79	0 0,00	25 3,78
Students	1084	182 16,7	484 44,6	313 28,9	14 1,3	91 8,4
Administration	229	28 12,2	93 40,6	79 34,5	0 0,0	29 12,7
Total	1974	266 13,6	894 45,2	655 33,2	14 0,7	145 7,3

T a b l e No.23

23. Examinees' opinions on the question which self-management organs at the Faculty have the greatest influence on the instruction improvement

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. Faculty Teachers Board	b. Year Councils	c. Faculty Council	d. Board for Instruction problems	e. Faculty Assembly	f. Executive Board	g. Some other organs	h. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	212 32,07	73 11,04	49 7,41	75 11,34	3 0,45	15 2,27	45 6,8o	352 53,25
Students	1084	160 14,73	113 10,43	83 7,65	35 3,23	13 1,19	37 3,41	39 3,59	810 74,7
Administration	229	41 17,9o	4 1,78	28 12,23	5 2,18	1 0,43	4 1,78	4 1,78	163 71,17
Total	1974	413 20,92	190 9,62	160 8,1o	115 5,82	17 0,86	56 2,83	88 2,83	1325 67,12

T a b l e No.24

24. Examinees' answer to the question which problems have been predominantly dealt with by the self-management organs at the Faculty up to now

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. Curriculum & syllabi	b. - c. Instruction modernization & Improvement	d. Improvement of Research work	e. Faculty Financing	f. Organizational problems	g. Division of Income	h. Human relations	i. Other questions	x. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	478 72,31	372 56,28	283 42,81	368 55,67	261 39,5o	256 38,73	82 12,4o	3 0,45	46 6,95
Students	1084	594 54,8o	478 44,o9	204 18,81	292 26,93	129 11,9o	107 9,87	96 8,85	15 1,38	242 22,32
Administration	229	109 47,59	104 45,41	82 35,8o	91 39,73	56 24,45	89 38,86	30 13,1o	1 0,43	63 27,51
Total	1974	1381 69,88	954 48,32	569 28,82	751 38,o5	446 22,6o	452 22,89	208 10,53	19 0,96	351 17,78

T a b l e No.25

25. In which fields at the Faculty the more significant results in self-management have been achieved - Examinees' opinions

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. Improved financial condition of the Faculty	b.- e. Modernization and improvement of pedag. organ of instruction	c. Increased income of employees	d. Improved curriculum & syllabus	f. Improved scientific & Research work	g. Something else	h. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	173 26,17	267 40,4o	102 15,43	242 36,61	179 27,o7	14 2,11	164 24,81
Students	1084	206 19,oo	320 29,52	124 11,43	257 23,7o	143 13,19	17 1,56	366 33,76
Administration	229	58 25,32	59 25,76	47 20,52	54 23,58	41 17,9o	8 3,49	90 39,3o
Total	1974	437 22,13	646 32,72	273 13,82	553 28,o1	363 18,38	39 1,97	620 31,4o

T a b l e No.26

26. Examinees' opinions on teachers students relations .

Category of Examinees	Totally Examined	a. Absolutely satisfactory (co-operational and the like		b. Partly satisfactory		c. Not satisfactory		d. Some other answers		e. Without answers	
Teaching Staff	661	257	38,9o	311	47,o4	30	4,53	0	0,o	63	9,53
Students	1084	306	28,22	529	48,8o	91	8,39	2	0,18	156	14,41
Administration	229	63	27,51	81	35,37	19	8,29	0	0,oo	66	28,83
Total	1974	626	31,71	921	46,65	140	7,o9	2	0,1o	285	14,45

T a b l e No.27

27. Examinees' opinions on socio-political organization influence upon self-management at Faculty

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. very important		b. Important		c. Relativly weak influence		d. No influence at all		e. Without answer	
			%		%		%		%		%
Teaching Staff	661	45	6,81	239	36,15	253	38,30	47	7,11	77	11,63
Students	1084	148	13,65	422	38,92	274	25,30	52	4,79	188	17,34
Administration	229	12	5,25	55	24,01	69	30,14	28	12,22	65	28,38
Total	1974	205	10,39	716	36,27	596	30,20	127	6,43	330	16,71

Table No.28

28. Examinees' opinion on the question what hampers the development of self-management at the Faculty

Category of Examinees	Totally examined	a. No financial means	g. Bureaucratical groups	d. No interest among teachers	e.-x. No interest	f. Not enough responsibility in self-man. organs	i. Relatio n society-faculty is not regulated	b. Low income	c. Lack in qual. teach. cadre	y. Other reasons	z. Without answer
Teaching Staff	661	87 13,16	61 9,26	20 3,02	12 1,81	3 1,21	7 1,05	5 0,75	5 0,75	142 21,48	370 56,00
Students	1084	9 0,83	43 3,96	19 1,75	69 6,36	12 1,09	3 0,26	0	2 0,18	204 18,81	717 66,14
Administration	229	6	8	1	2	1	0	3	0	30 13,10	181 79,03
Total	1974	102 5,16	112 5,67	40 2,02	84 4,20	21 1,06	10 0,50	8 0,40	7 0,35	376 19,04	1268 64,23

T a b l e No.29

29. Examinees' proposals for improvement and better affirmation of self-management at the Faculty

Proposals	N=1974	N=661 Teaching Staff	N=1084 Students	N=229 Administration
1. Provide for higher financial means	78 3,91	60	9	9
2. Provide for equal Students' participation	78 3,91	9	67	2
3. Greater interest among teachers & students	73 3,69	26	45	2
4. All should have the same rights	59 2,99	37	13	9
5. Greater responsibility of self-managing organs	23 1,16	16	4	3
6. Better qualified teadher	8 0,40	4	4	0
7. Higher income	7 0,35	6	0	1
8. Specialists should decide on professional problems	7 0,35	5	2	0
9. To define the place of Faculty in Society	7 0,35	6	0	1
10. To define the place of Faculty within University	6 0,30	3	3	0
11. Other kinds of proposals	342 17,32	135	182	25
12. Without answer	1345 68,13	408 61,71	755 69,65	182 80,00